

Lansanne is commitment — and Lansanne is
cooperation. The two do not easily go together. —

if you look to Asia — the most populated,
least civilized continent in the world — still staggered by
the immensity of the work that must be done — but
greatly encouraged by what Lansanne has
done for commitment and cooperation.

Review

- 1-500 - tough new Rome. Theological education: mainly Xt. serv + grm.
550-750. Irish + Eng. highly contextualized people movements.
1100-1300. High Middle Ages
1 Reformation
1730-1914. Evangelical Awakening. Decision Commission
World Missions.

Modern Revivals. - Korea, Chile, Hawaii, Brazil

1830s China (Sung) E. Africa Revival.

~~In East More people than they do & hospitable, than though its churches
Only 12% of pop. need the Bible regularly,
E. Africa - most populated, least evangelized.~~

At Lausanne ~~the~~ theological ~~the~~ came of age -
a new balance, a new breadth, without losing the focus -
the depth of the gospel.

There have been world congresses of evangelists (as Berlin) -
Lausanne is a Congress of World evangelists. A wise shift from
speculation on what we ^{where we are} are doing - ^{more serious consideration of} to what mission & to do where
we ought to be: - reaching ^{all}, not just the 13% we are reaching now.

There have been conferences on evangelism that condemned Ev.
social action. Lausanne refuses to polarize & set one part of
the gospel against another. The preaching of the gospel, says Lausanne, cannot
be separated from its application & implications. Faith & works belong together.

~~There has been a rediscovery of the~~

Other conferences have stressed the preaching of the gospel. Lausanne
reminds us that Jesus preached the Kingdom.

Other conferences have inspired to evangelism. Lausanne inspires
and informs. A new, healthy emphasis on facts, statistics.

Delegates - 710 load - 300 300

Ind. 50

Kr. 56

gyp. 40+

Bishops + Baptists + Brethren

Calvinists + charismatics

Anti-wcc + pro wcc

Men + women (not a-h) - Kousko-jel

(not a-h women)

not a-h food

not a-h time)

Leadership -

Billy Graham

Jack Darrow - Church. (

Don Hks - TEAM

Paul Little - PB(?)

George Denny - Sects Presb. (unship)

idv - Stan Monaghan

Am. Bible Soc

Lausanne

The second great congress on evangelism: - Berlin 66; Lausanne 74. There were differences. Lausanne was bigger (2,700 + 1300); more representative (5th world). And most important: -
Berlin 66 - World Congress on Evangelism
Lausanne 74 - Int. Congress on World Evangelization.

Berlin was focused on evangelism (the reaching out) - Lausanne was focused on the world - the whole world - especially those parts of the world which have not been reached. It was a missionary congress.

① Leadership & representation

From the very beginning it was missionary (in the broad sense), not evangelistic (in the narrow sense). ^{Population clock -} I've never heard Billy Graham better than in his opening address on the urgency of mission today - or Dr. John Stott, a ^{man} All Souls, Lond. clearer than in his clarifying definition of mission and

& salvation & Xn social action - or Stan Morningham more moving than in his wide-ranging survey of the world's still unmet human needs - all the needs - physical as well as spiritual.

~~The very first evening there was a slide-show presentation on the statistics~~
It was a focused Congress - but the focus was broad. Broad but clear - no polarization of evangelism & Xn social action, but no confusion, either.

The very first evening - a slide-show presentation on the statistics of church growth & missions since 1800. A sobering reminder that our successes have been real - but uneven & the unfinished task staggering. As Ralph Winter pointed out - half the world lives in Asia & Asia is only 2% Xn. Asia has the world's three greatest unreached blocs, the Chinese, the Hindus & the Muslims. And only 5% of the present missionary force is work to reach them.

THE Reformed Journal

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

SEPTEMBER 1974 - 50c

Lausanne '74

J. Ramsey Michaels

plus:

famine in Africa; freedom in Korea

Ford in the White House

editorials—articles—reviews

THE Reformed Journal

A Periodical of Reformed Comment and Opinion

VOLUME 24 NUMBER 7

SEPTEMBER, 1974

Editors

Harry R. Boer
James Daane
Richard J. Mouw
Lewis B. Smedes
George Stob
Henry Stob
John Timmerman
Nicholas Wolterstorff

Contributing Editors

Daniel H. Benson
Harold Dekker
Karen DeVos
Edward Ericson, Jr.
Howard G. Hageman
Dewey J. Holtenga, Jr.
Arthur F. Holmes
Dirk W. Jellema
Hugh A. Koops
George I. Mavrodes
Henry Pietersma
Alvin C. Plantinga
Nelvin Vos

Managing Editor

Marlin Van Elderen

Advertising-Circulation Manager

Roger Verhuist

Publisher

William B. Eerdmans, Jr.

- 3 **AS WE SEE IT.** The resignation of Richard Nixon and consequent accession of Gerald Ford to the US presidency is the subject of two editorials this month, one by editor **Nicholas Wolterstorff**, the other by managing editor **Marlin VanElderen**. **John Timmerman** talks about his own profession—teaching; **Richard Mouw** continues the discussion of the "Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern"; **James Daane** comments about the task of the church; and **Harry Boer** measures the scope of the famine in Africa.
- 9 **J. RAMSEY MICHAELS: LAUSANNE—A SHOW OF STRENGTH.** With a budget of \$3.3 million and a conscious effort to involve more Third World persons than ever before, July's International Congress on World Evangelization was another in the series of mammoth evangelical convocations. Gordon-Conwell New Testament Professor **J. Ramsey Michaels**, a Lausanne delegate, watched the proceedings for the benefit of *Journal* readers. Here is his assessment of the meetings' success.
- 14 **WAYNE G. BOULTON: PATRICIA HEARST/TANIA AND A THEOLOGY OF THE FAMILY.** The biblical position on the family is ambivalent, notes **Wayne Boulton**, who teaches religion at Hope College, Holland, Michigan. Its two poles are reflected in two post-"kidnaping" statements by Patricia Hearst.
- 18 **KAREN DE VOS: FREEDOM IN KOREA TODAY.** Since this article was completed, an assassin attempted to dispatch South Korean President Park, killing his wife and dramatizing anew the unrest in this inflation-ridden and insecure country. Christians are not sitting back unnoticed, says **Karen DeVos**, who has just returned from a summer in the more placid precincts of Bristol, Rhode Island.
- 20 **MIDGE SHERWOOD: CHESTERTON—A CENTURY LATER.** A look at one of Christianity's most quotable defenders, an English journalist best known to many (like another Christian writer, Dorothy Sayers) for mystery stories, is offered by **Midge Sherwood**, free-lance writer, organizer of the Chesterton Society of Friends, and resident of San Marino, California.
- 24 **WILLIAM HASKER: ABORTION AND THE DEFINITION OF A PERSON.** **William Hasker**, who teaches philosophy at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, proposes a new mode of approach to the basic question that abortion raises: Is the fetus a human being or not?
- 27 **JOURNAL REVIEW.** Book reviewers **Winifred Holkeboer** and **Steve J. Van Der Weele** are both members of the English Department at Calvin College. **Edna Otte** is a Calvin graduate now living in Connecticut.

Published ten times a year (monthly, with May-June and July-August combined) by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., 255 Jefferson SE, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49502. Copyright © 1974 by Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. All rights reserved under the International Copyright Union, the Universal Copyright Convention and the Pan-American Copyright Convention. Second-class postage paid at Grand Rapids, Michigan. Comments and opinions published herein are not, by reason of that fact, necessarily shared by the publisher, or every member of the editorial staff, or every non-staff contributor, or every advertiser. No one, unless he expressly so states, presumes to speak in the name of any business firm, school, church, institution, person, or group of persons. Member Associated Church Press and Evangelical Press Association. Subscription rates: \$5.00 one year; \$9.00 two years; \$12.00 three years; 50c individual copies. Address all subscriptions and change of address notices to the Subscription Department, The Reformed Journal, 255 Jefferson SE, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49502. Allow four weeks for address changes. Editorial and advertising communications should be addressed to Managing Editor and Advertising Manager respectively.

Grace Spurned

On the evening of August 8 Richard Nixon laid aside the presidency of the United States. The next day Senator Hugh Scott (like several others whose language was less colorful) expressed the hope that Americans would not now seek from Mr. Nixon the blood that went along with that "pound of flesh." In other words, on the Senator's view, Mr. Nixon should now be free from prosecution for those activities that were the occasion for his resignation.

The magnanimity recommended by Senator Scott, in addition to being infelicitously expressed, is premature. The time for pardon is surely after we discover just what it is we are being asked to forgive Mr. Nixon for, not now in an outpouring of euphoria over the fact of his departure. Similarly, our relief at his leaving office ought not to exempt the *manner* of that departure from critical commentary, for that has an important bearing on the issue of his pardon.

Let me begin by acknowledging Mr. Nixon's imaginative achievements in foreign policy—with the provision that it remains for the future to judge the moral and strategic limitations of these policies. Quite apart from that impressive record, the fact remains that for several years he and his closest aides regularly disregarded the basic rights assured Americans by the Constitution and condoned and practiced illegal means to serve no nobler end than the aggrandizement of his own personal power. When the revelations of such malfeasance brought government nearly to a standstill and all of political life under general cynicism and contempt, Mr. Nixon finally went on national television, admitted to mistakes in judgment that had led to the erosion of his political base, and resigned. Most of that momentous speech of resignation was given over to a recital of his successes and of his now shipwrecked plans for even more good. It was like a campaign speech, and one was led to the fleeting thought that he has in mind now to mothball this rhetoric until 1976 or 1980 when he can try for the White House again.

The impression has sometimes been given that Mr. Nixon is an avid reader of history (though one suspects that biography is more to his taste). When it came to writing a quarter-hour history of his own

administration, however, Mr. Nixon lapsed into propaganda, recalling only the good times. Not long after it started, Richard Nixon's most important address became a bore.

Some would see in Mr. Nixon's capacity to render uninteresting one of the most significant political occasions in American history a clue to his personality. The extreme form of this view holds, quite simply, that Mr. Nixon is a madman. This is no human being—this cold, calculating executive, coolest when others are hottest, who delights in recounting his sangfroid under pressure; this poker player who once bluffed his way to \$1500 holding a pair of deuces; this amoral autocrat who could turn viciously on Herbert Klein, L. Patrick Gray, John Mitchell, and George Shultz, without regard for or regret over their long record of loyalty to him.

That is a tempting interpretation, especially in view of the indecencies of the Nixon administration. As bad as Watergate was, let us not forget the 1972 Christmas bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, nor his shameless boast, to this day, that his persistence in that unpopular violence ended the Vietnam war and ushered in the Generation of Peace.

But though the interpretation is tempting, I wonder whether Christian theology does not teach us to look at the Nixon of the shattered presidency and resignation speech not as inhuman but as *all too human*. Indeed, for those who were ready to relate the actions of an Oswald to the climate of violence in Dallas, or the actions of an Arthur Bremer to the primal urges motivating Wallace and his legions, or the actions of a Lieutenant Calley to the baseness within every last one of us—for such persons it may be healthy to see our own souls on display in the letting-go of Richard Nixon.

Summarizing the Nixon doctrine of the presidency might be the bumpersticker paraphrase of Erich Segal: "Being President means never having to say you're sorry." To the end Nixon clung to the interpretation that he had at most made errors of judgment and "omission," and had offered accounts that were "at variance with" the facts. Even after he himself released the evidence that linked him incontrovertibly to the Watergate coverup, he refused to confess any wrongdoing.

It was on such a full confession of wrongdoing that Senator Edward Brooke's "sense of the Congress" resolution recommending that Mr. Nixon be free from prosecution, was to be predicated. But no

full admission—not even a partial admission—was ever forthcoming.

Here is a vivid parable of man's disposition from time immemorial. Objectively considered, the offer of grace seems too good to be true. But the subjective obstacles it must try to overcome prove far more recalcitrant than one would think. The conditional clause of John's oft-cited assurance of pardon—*if we confess our sins*—proves a stumbling block. How much easier to bring a few small tokens in one's hands, and to mention good intentions unrealized, in the touching hope that no one will notice the fatal flaws.

In a sense, then, Mr. Nixon before the television cameras is Everyman. Yet he is of course far more than a parable. He and his administration actually happened. And thus to speak of his removal from office as "a pound of flesh" seems exaggerated—and far less pertinent than to observe that he left rejecting grace. What would seem to follow from the latter is that he *may* yet be punished for that of which he is proved guilty. The hard question for the months ahead is, *Must* he be punished?

Marlin J. VanElderen

Forward from Anarchy

Mr. Gerald Ford has not been on my list of most admired politicians. For some fourteen years I have lived in the congressional district he served; and I have found him steady but unimaginative in his role as our representative, excessively partisan in his loyalties, and unblinkingly—sometimes even unthinkingly—conservative in his views. I have often said, "We ought to put up a good candidate to run against him."

I haven't yet shed all those feelings. But I did find his short speech after his inauguration to be very moving. And I am coming to the view that he may be exactly the sort of person the United States needs after its two years of trauma.

The speech displayed a *person*—itself a refreshing experience after six years of masks and mimes. But also there were many things I liked about the person.

Especially the humility. Here it seemed to me was a man who genuinely felt the need for the support and advice of others. He didn't spout all sorts of self-serving claims about having achieved the *first* of this, the *last* of that, the *only* of that third thing—"a generation of peace," "peace for us and our grandchildren," etc., etc. He just expressed a workmanlike

commitment to doing a job, and a willingness, seemingly, to let the historians do their job of commenting and assessing.

What also came across was a quality of serenity. Mr. Ford has that sort of dullness about him which is often characteristic of serene people. And already that somewhat dull serenity has calmed the country. Even the evening news has become far less interesting than it was over the past two years. For that I give thanks. News is best when dull. There's always art for drama.

Then there was the desire for reconciliation. In the political realm of course this usually comes to compromise; and I well realize that compromise often blurs what is right and necessary. But still, reconciliation is what we need. Mr. Ford's predecessor was of course radically different. He saw politics, indeed, life itself, in terms of the need for combat rather than the need for reconciliation. Ironically, in his last speech he even used combative language when stating his desire for peace. Peace in means as well as goals can now do us no harm.

And then there was the faith, the genuine Christian faith—not some comments tacked on for rhetorical benefit but the expression of genuine dependence on God. I know, of course, that people can have genuine faith in God and yet be woefully incompetent and misguided in political matters. His faith does not give us a guarantee that Mr. Ford will be a good President. Yet a sense of being under the law and the judgment of God, as well as under his grace, is what our country badly needs.

The newspapers are filled now with commentators congratulating us on our "system." "The system got rid of Nixon and replaced him with Ford." I'm not at all sure that such self-congratulation is much in order. It seems to me that it was mainly the incredible stupidity of the President and his aides, and the courage of Sirica, Cox, Richardson, and Ruckelshaus, which brought us to this point. Of course, these latter men occupied positions in the system. But just as there are governmental systems under which we would still have Nixon as our chief, so also there are others under which he would have been removed long ago.

But what must also be said is that often the office makes the man. When people are forced by their position in the system to take a stand, they often display hitherto untapped resources of courage and nobility and integrity. That was true, I think, of several of the men on the Judiciary Committee. And it may also be true of Gerald Ford. Perhaps he will in his new position display qualities of insight and concern and imagination which up to now have been recessive. Or if not that, perhaps he will have the gift

and the grace to recognize and acknowledge them in others. I devoutly hope so. For then we can not only emerge from our two years of federal anarchy, but move forward to deal with the enormous problems facing us.

Mr. Ford has our best wishes and our sincere prayers.

Nicholas P. Wolterstorff

Thirty and Out?

The Michigan Educational Association is now joining other unions in recommending thirty years of work and out with a substantial pension.

I can understand such demands from miners, whose work is clammy and dangerous. The work in automobile factories is often unbearably monotonous and noisy. Wholly apart from the economical hazards of such lush life-styles, I regard the recommendation for the teachers of Michigan with great disappointment. Sixteen to twenty years of preparation, thirty years of application, then disuse and rust for groomed and developed talents? Are the teachers bone-tired of drudgery? Is teaching such a hard life? Are they simply seeking a new career? Are they really convinced that at fifty-five a teacher is no longer fit to teach? All of these reasons fill me with disappointment, because they all strike me as unworthy of the idea of a profession.

If one is entirely satisfied with the dictionary idea of a profession, there is no problem. The dictionary defines a profession as "an occupation that properly involves a liberal, scientific, or artistic education, and usually mental rather than manual labor." If this properly describes medicine, the law, the ministry and teaching, "thirty and out" fails to describe a fault. But many years ago at Calvin College, Professor J. Broene elaborated an idea of a profession that struck me as compelling and made a lifelong impression on me. In addition to the foregoing description a profession is a deliberately chosen life work in which one spares no reasonable effort to improve the quality of one's service year after year. Furthermore, one does not enter a profession for gain or greed, although both are occasional corrupters of the work. Since then I have always thought that a truly professional person is humbly aware and pur-suant of an ideal that transcends selfish motives, serves it as long as he can, and leaves it not with euphoria but regret.

This idea of a profession may seem to some a bit of archaic nonsense; yet my feeling is that if a

teacher operates with the slogan "thirty and out," it will affect the quality of his teaching well before his thirty years are over. He will probably taper off in the last five, possibly even the last ten years of his teaching. Why work so hard when the end is near? He will be more concerned with pension plans than lesson plans. He will be thinking about his next career or planning a little fishing, golf, shuffleboard and all the other hair-raising diversions of the golden years. He will be out of it before the thirty years are up.

There is, of course, one argument which would be overwhelmingly convincing if it were true. That argument is simply based on the assumption that at fifty-five one's pedagogical skills will have peaked; after that one's competence attenuates and withers. Effectiveness diminishes year after year and often ten years later the moose will have become a mouse and taking money for service would be a swindle. How true is this?

In the professions the work is largely mental, and the age that counts is psychological rather than chronological. A baseball player is usually finished at thirty-five; a good surgeon or clergyman grows into excellence at about this time. I have known young students who were mentally old and brittle. The young men of the late 1960s were the oldest young men I ever taught. They had little hope and next to no humor. They pursued their vision of gloom with grim intensity. They possessed little irony, especially about themselves. I have known old people with spark, humor, zest, even malleability. A teacher is aged by his outlook and nerves rather than physical strain. Some of the finest teachers I have had were not young; some of the poorest were. This reason for "thirty and out" belies all my experience. Furthermore, certain things balance out. The older teacher may not be able to identify as readily or as completely with young minds as he once did, but he has learned patience and understanding; he may not be as interestingly bold in statement, but he has probably acquired more knowledge and good sense; he may no longer be young but he has probably had children.

Am I then in favor of "Death and Out" or the old appointments *ad vitam*? This makes no sense, not even in Congress. There are signs in a teacher, attitudes and behavior which indicate, at whatever age they occur, that the time to quit is at hand. Here are, I think, some of them. If at the beginning of the year the teacher no longer looks at the class lists with curiosity and eagerness; if he does not scrutinize his classes with genuine interest and talks to them as if he were merely fulfilling a duty; if he becomes bored and irritated with the scanty infor-

mation, the ungrounded but pontifically stated opinions, and the general immaturity of his students, if he approaches the reading of papers without any anticipation of finding something genuinely laudable; if the zest of sharing memorable thoughts and feelings is evaporating; if he no longer likes young people with all their varied reactions, problems and obtainable affections; if all those *ifs* fit him he should quit whether he is thirty or sixty. Everybody agrees with that, but what if none of them fits?

John Timmerman

Evangelical Social Concern: Why I Signed

Recently in these pages theologian Paul Jewett explained why he would not sign the Declaration of Evangelical Social Concern.

In contrast to other criticisms of the Declaration (for example, the *Presbyterian Journal's* snide description of the signers, a group that included Carl Henry, Frank Gaebelin, Vernon Grounds and Paul Rees, as “self-styled evangelical leaders”), Professor Jewett’s criticisms are significant ones. They boil down to one crucial observation: the framers of the Declaration were not serious enough.

It is one thing, Jewett argues, to speak in general terms about racism, economic injustice, poverty, and liberation; it is quite another to translate such talk into specific commitments. Are we willing to support integrated education in our local communities? Or the struggles of migrant farm workers? Or hungry black children? Or the efforts of women to find equality in our churches? Professor Jewett’s illustrative questions are important ones. As a signer of the Declaration I am willing to join any of these four causes (though not all of them at once). Furthermore, I agree with the point these questions illustrate: declarations are inadequate unless they lead to specific commitments of discipleship.

But Professor Jewett and I are not *quite* in full agreement. I believe that this Declaration has some value apart from whether all—or most—of its actual signers engage in the kinds of causes he refers to. I see the basic function of the Declaration differently from the way he does. I view it as a pastoral letter to the larger evangelical community, a letter that points to an *agenda* that must be taken seriously. I suspect that many of the older evangelical leaders who signed the Declaration did so not so much to endorse the individual items as to offer a sort of

patriarchal blessing to the concerns of a younger generation. They were saying: “Listen to these young people. You don’t have to agree with everything they say, but take them seriously. They are brothers and sisters in Christ and they are onto something important.” Of course I, like Professor Jewett, hope for more than this. Nonetheless, this in itself is significant.

Professor Jewett is correct to insist that the words of this Declaration must issue in deeds. But this may happen even if the Declaration does not result in specific actions on the part of the actual signers. I have talked recently with two representatives of mainline denominational “social action” agencies who have insisted that not only has the Chicago Declaration convinced them of their own shortcomings in relating social action to biblical and theological themes, but also that they have been able to appeal to it in order to combat a growing “otherworldly” fundamentalism in their denominations.

But we must not ignore the important supportive and “consciousness-raising” function of such a Declaration. Some of us who signed the Declaration are still too mindful of the oppressive patterns of American evangelicalism to view, as Jewett does, this “piece of paper” as “innocuous.” If the Chicago Declaration had appeared as an editorial in the student newspaper at the Christian college I attended over a decade ago the writer would have been expelled for a “negative attitude.” During my graduate school years, when I could not avoid the issues of racism and my draft status, it was difficult to find an evangelical leader who would even privately encourage me in my struggles — and I appeal here to personal experience only because I am confident that thousands of similar stories can be told. How good it would have been then to hear the “mere words” of this Declaration from the likes of Carl Henry or Paul Rees, or, indeed, Paul Jewett.

Finally, we have — at least — a piece of paper that young men and women who are radically serious about putting their “all on the altar” can send home to their parents and show to their teachers, saying, “See? I’m not alone. I’m not odd. Even *they* think that such matters are to be taken seriously.” For some of us the “mere words” of this Declaration come too late to offer that kind of help. But we must not let another generation go through the loneliness and pain that we suffered, without a word of comfort or encouragement.

I appreciate Professor Jewett’s concerns. I cannot accept his conclusion. I thank the Lord for the

Chicago Declaration. It was too long in coming, and it is, admittedly, only a beginning. But it is a good beginning.

Richard J. Mouw

“The Primary Task of the Church”

“It is time for evangelicals to refuse to use sentences that begin with ‘the primary task of the Church is . . .’ regardless of whether the sentence ends with *worship* or *evangelism* or *Bible teaching* or ‘*social concerns*.’ They are all integral, necessary aspects of the Church’s task. If we are to remain faithful to the Bible and avoid new divisions, we must forsake formulations that suggest that any one of these tasks is ‘primary’ and the others ‘secondary’ and therefore to be done in our spare time.” So says Professor Ronald J. Sider of Messiah College, Philadelphia, in his review of Donald G. Bloesch’s *The Evangelical Renaissance* (*Christianity Today*, July 5, 1974). Amen.

Sider is so right, so Christian. Yet what he says has been heard so infrequently that it should be shouted, loud and clear, and over and over. For those who claim that “the primary task of the church is to preach the gospel” never really accept the implication of that statement. They never really acknowledge that the church has any other task, though they prattle endlessly about “the church’s primary task.” Apparently they have not sensed that it is meaningless to emphasize that the church has a primary task if it has no secondary task. The implied secondary task was denied by the frequently announced insistence that churches that act on their social concerns are by that very fact neglecting their task of preaching the gospel.

Those who talk that way, of course, do not really believe that the church has either spare time or a secondary task.

Happily, evangelicals are becoming increasingly aware of the social dimensions of the gospel. Yet the most articulate of them at least do not believe that the *church* should be socially involved. Under a renewed understanding of the gospel, they are reaching for a social ethic. But so far it has eluded their grasp. Until evangelicals recognize the social, corporate character of the Christian church, they will never have room in their theology for a Christian social ethic.

What Sider said quietly in a book review should be shouted in the headlines.

James Daane

Suffering in the Sahel

After five years of steadily decreasing rainfall a great drought is stretching from the Atlantic to the Red Sea in the sub-Saharan area known as the Sahel. This area covers two and one-half million square miles or about one-fifth of the African continent. Normally it sustains a population of sixty-five million. Now scores of thousands, their herds dead, their livelihood gone, have migrated southward. Jos, twelve miles from where I live, situated in the center of northern Nigeria, has received hundreds of immigrants from the Sahel. Hola, farther east, is reported to have twenty thousand. So it goes in all the immediate sub-Saharan (savannah) areas.

Famine conditions have sparked a long overdue revolution in Ethiopia and precipitated a coup in Niger. There is among sociological, climatological, and agronomic experts deep concern about both the economic and the human future of the vast area.

What is happening in the Sahel?

About 20,000 B.C., as geologists read it, Europe was covered with ice as far south as the middle Rhine. What is now Sahara (from the Arabic *sabrā*, meaning wilderness) was then pleasant grassland drained by river systems and supporting a varied animal population. Men lived there enjoying abundant water and food supplies. They maintained domestic animals. The climate throughout was what is today called the Mediterranean type.

Eighteen or nineteen millennia ago this began to change. The ice covering northern Europe began to melt and recede northward. The result was that the area now known as the Sahara saw its rainfall gradually decrease. The once verdant area became the desert it now is. At its southern border (16 to 18 degrees latitude) the situation stabilized. From there the annual rainfall varies from a few inches to thirty inches a year in the Sahel zone; from thirty to sixty inches in the savannah zone, in which most of Nigeria lies; and from sixty to one hundred inches in the rain forest area and along the West African coast.

Between the savannah and the true Sahara lies a zone that shifts from time to time depending on the amount of rain that falls on it. In good rain years the savannah moves as it were northward; in poor rain years the Sahara moves southward. Until recently this seesaw variation was a movement within fairly well defined limits. It is this zone that is called the Sahel; and it is there that a tragedy of major proportions has been unfolding.

It would appear that the basic problem is not one of climatological or natural circumstances only, but

to a large extent one of human and technological factors. From time immemorial the large Sahel population has been extensively, perhaps predominantly, nomadic in character. They are herdsmen, moving with their flocks of camels, cows, goats, and sheep over vast grassland areas. Over the centuries certain patterns of time and movement have come into being determining where, when, and how long grazing will be done. In lush years the herds increased. This led to water shortage and overgrazing, an imbalance which was corrected in part by varying the movements of the herds, in part by animal deaths, and in part by succeeding drier years. Nature was a pretty good policeman. Sometimes the adjustments were regional in character, sometimes continent-wide. In 1913-1914 an adjustment of the latter kind took place. Through all its variations, however, the Sahel remained basically unchanged and so did its nomadic population.

The present dislocation is a cow of a different color. From a natural viewpoint alone the situation is utterly serious. Over a period of five years rains have been abnormally low. In an earlier day nature would have exerted her customary pressure on men and animals, leading in one way or another to larger than usual sales of cattle for meat, more animal deaths, fewer births, and doubtless some migration. Then there would have been waiting for years of normalcy to return, and life would have gone on again as in immemorial times before.

This normal cycle did, indeed, finally begin, but not until an artificially created delay had served to compound the ultimate damage. Animal deaths, decrease in births, sale of cattle, migration—all were postponed by a large and wholly well-intended international effort to provide water. Both the Sahara and the Sahel literally rest on vast oceans of water thousands of feet under the surface. Into this and into less deep subterranean sources, international crews of relief personnel drilled hundreds of bore holes in many parts of the Sahel. This provided an abundance of water, and it made possible a delay in facing the somewhat obscured reality that water was water and not fodder for cattle or food for men. Cattle tramped their way to the same bore holes day after day crushing out any grass life that still remained, sometimes for areas up to forty miles

around watering centers. Stark famine faced the huge herds. Investigators have opened up cattle stomachs and have found grass roots in them.

Finally, even abundant water supplies could neither hide nor stop the inevitable. Cattle died by the thousands; men, women, and children who could do so migrated southward into Nigeria and other sub-Saharan countries. Those who lacked the strength or the means to leave were cast on national and international relief agencies or through hunger into the arms of death. No small part of the relief problem in the Sahel is the absence of adequate roads to transport needed foods and other supplies. The whole phenomenon is very much reminiscent of the Dust Bowl tragedy in the United States in the mid-1930s.

Scientists are searching for causes and patterns of climate and rainfall, looking as far afield as weather conditions in India to explain the Sahelian phenomenon. There are sundry theories but so far no view seems to be established with any degree of certainty.

Several things are clear in Nigeria, however. During all the years of drought in the Sahel (which includes the more northern areas of Nigeria) there has been only one poor rain year in the country as a whole—1973. In the Benue-Plateau State (where nearly all Christian Reformed mission work is being done) 1973 rainfall was 43 inches, compared with an average annual rainfall of 49 to 53 inches. But even in that year the over-all food production in that state was higher than in any previous year. This was due to increased acreage and possibly, along with it, an advantageous natural spacing of the rainfall making for maximum utilization of the rain supply. This year rainfall in Benue-Plateau State is heavy, while the issue of adequate seasonal rains in the Sahel is, at this writing, still very much in doubt. The somber report in *Time* magazine, May 13, suggesting that all of Nigeria is a famine area is a case of sheer overzealous reporting.

Meanwhile, the suffering in the Sahel goes on and relief problems in areas to which many of its people have migrated constitute a call to the world church and charitable agencies to help as may be possible.

Harry R. Boer

LAUSANNE: a show of strength

J. RAMSEY MICHAELS

The thirty-mile bus ride from the Geneva airport to Lausanne went quickly. I talked with a young seminary graduate having difficulty getting ordained in the Presbyterian Church because he opposed the idea of women elders. Most of the people on the bus were from the United States, and the other conversations alternated between small talk and issues long familiar to American evangelicals.

I had seen only the airport in Geneva this time; and when we reached Lausanne my impression was that its natural surroundings were even more beautiful than those of its neighbor. We were in the shadow of Calvin's city, and—of perhaps more immediate import—at the doorstep of the World Council of Churches. In a day or two, almost three thousand people from all over the world would gather in the Palais de Beaulieu for the International Congress on World Evangelization, Lausanne '74.

Pre-Congress planning had been excellent. Most major addresses had been printed and sent out in advance. Written comments and questions, to which the speakers would have opportunity to reply, were solicited. Hotels, flight reservations, sightseeing tours had been arranged by the Congress staff.

The careful planning bore fruit. A newspaper and press releases chronicled each day's events and helped us understand how the Congress saw itself and how it wanted to be seen by the world and the media. Headsets provided adequate (if not always smooth or lucid) translations into six languages of all the addresses at plenary sessions. Daily seminars (mostly in English, with only haphazard provision for translation) involved all participants and many observers in discussion of theological issues, specific areas of evangelistic concern, and strategies for each national group represented. I was awed by the planning and hard work, the spiritual dedication and the financial cost which had gone into this enterprise.

But what was it all about? Why were we here?

* * *

Billy Graham, in his opening address, seemed to sense that this question was in the minds of many, and tried to put Lausanne in historical perspective. He cited as prototypes of this Congress the early ecumenical gatherings at New York (1900) and Edinburgh (1910), which had focused on evangelism and missions. This initial evangelistic thrust within the ecumenical movement had been blunted in sub-

sequent generations, he said, sometimes in favor of churchmanship or ecumenism for its own sake, and sometimes in favor of social and political activity aimed at corporate salvation, "humanization," or "liberation." Graham's thrust was that a major concern of Lausanne '74 would be to get things back on track. Here was an evangelical answer to the ecumenical congresses at Uppsala in 1968 and Bangkok in 1973. But in what spirit?

The appeal to historical beginnings could have implied simply a concern for reform within a broader ecumenical framework, a friendly dialog or an irenic witness to the "brothers and sisters" at WCC headquarters in Geneva. World Council General Secretary Philip Potter had expressed hopes for "input" from Lausanne into the Jakarta assembly slated for 1975. For his part Graham stated that "We have had only the warmest relations with the World Council of Churches." But this was not the dominant tone at Lausanne.

While there was no actual belligerence toward the WCC (Lausanne '74 was itself picketed every day by Carl McIntire and his associates), there were no greetings sent to Geneva and no official participants or observers from the World Council. This was an evangelical show of strength, more like the laying down of a gauntlet than a fraternal word of admonition to a group of fellow Christians. If the evangelical voice was muted at Uppsala and Bangkok, the liberal voice was nonexistent at Lausanne, just as it had been at the Berlin Congress in 1966.

Despite McIntire's misgivings, there was as much doctrinal purity at Lausanne as it is possible to attain in an assembly of three thousand individuals from every corner of the globe. Even Graham's acknowledgment of warm relations with the WCC raised the hackles of some participants. But in his keynote address he was quite specific: "This is a conference of evangelicals. The participants were asked to come because you are evangelical—concerned with evangelism and missions; and we here tonight stand firmly in the evangelical tradition of biblical faith."

So here we were—evangelicals talking to ourselves, just as the liberals had talked to themselves at Uppsala and Bangkok. Was either of us talking to the rest of the world? And wasn't it time we began talking a little more to each other? These were some

of my thoughts as I listened to Billy Graham chart the course for our ten days together. Why was I here? Was this just a refuge in beautiful Switzerland from the hard American realities of Watergate and impeachment? Or was there something new here, some insights to be gained, maybe even real work to be done?

As the Congress developed, it became clear that whatever the absence of liberal Christians from our assembly meant, it did not mean a lack of significant issues. The issues are there with the risen Lord, "whenever two or three are gathered in his name," and they will no more go away by themselves than he will. At Lausanne the issues can be summarized under three headings, each involving a polarity: evangelism and social action; the West and the Third World; and a looser category centering on clergy and laity, but posing the wider question of mobilizing all available human resources for world evangelization.

* * *

In assessing "evangelism *versus* social action" (the "*versus*" creeps in no matter how hard we try to keep it out), I found myself persistently importing into my evaluation of speakers the traditional labels of "right" and "left." In simplest terms, those on the "right" define evangelism solely as the proclamation of the gospel for the salvation of souls, and assign social action a legitimate but secondary place as a natural (i.e. *supernatural*) result of individual conversions. Those on the "left" include social action in the definition of evangelism itself, insisting that the two are inseparable and that no priority can be assigned to one over against the other. The use of these labels seems appropriate because both posi-

tions can be distinguished from another, still further "left," which makes social action the primary if not the only task of the church, and indeed finds itself often working side by side with the *political* left. But in the setting of Lausanne '74, the categories of "right" and "left" were, as I soon discovered, totally inadequate.

The dominant view, both on the planning committee and among participants, was that evangelization must be very narrowly defined—all the more, it seemed, because the WCC assemblies at Uppsala and Bangkok had muddied the waters of religious language. The first draft of the Lausanne Covenant stated that "reconciliation among men is not reconciliation with God, nor is social action evangelism, nor is salvation political liberation." Although "Christian presence in the world" and "dialogue" are indispensable to evangelism, "evangelism itself is the proclamation of Christ, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God." The validity and necessity of social action were recognized, but as a second stage in the church's task, not as something integral to evangelization itself.

Much that was said at Lausanne sounded like an extension of Billy Graham's personal philosophy: the way to change society is to change the hearts of individuals. Priority was assigned to the "saving of souls" rather than to the transformation of culture. In this sense the dominant theology of evangelism at Lausanne was very traditional and conservative. Yet once the goals had been defined as primarily spiritual, most advocates of this position urged maximum flexibility in attaining them.

This was especially true of the "church growth"



*Signing
the Lausanne Covenant:
"long, unwieldy,
inconsistent with itself
at many points,
yet despite these shortcomings
much the better
for its generally honest attempt
to reflect
the complexity of the issues."*

strategists of mission associated especially with Fuller Seminary: Donald McGavran, Ralph Winter, Peter Wagner. They argued that the gospel of Christ will spread most rapidly in new areas if it does not attempt to overturn existing cultural patterns. Social and ethnic differences among various peoples, classes, and linguistic groups must be respected. They must not be made to worship together or live in close association before they are ready. Instead, the gospel must build on what it finds in each new cultural setting, expressing itself in ways appropriate to that setting. The Jew who becomes a Christian will not start eating ham; the aborigine will not sing to organ music; and, more sobering perhaps, the caste distinctions in India and the *apartheid* of South Africa will not at once disappear among Christian believers.

Above all, *Western* cultural patterns must not be imposed on non-Western peoples under the banner of the Christian mission. Because the gospel is transcultural, the evangelist must be adaptable, and sensitive to what is valid—or at least harmless—in cultures other than his own. In this sense, the position is not so conservative as it first appears. “Pragmatic” is perhaps a better word, for there is often a marked interest in numbers and in the quantitative measurement of results. To achieve measurable results, the gospel is reduced to its simplest terms. The strength of such an approach is its flexibility; a potential weakness is neglect of the gospel’s deeper implications.

This was the issue raised by the dissenting voices at Lausanne: not simply “social action” as against “evangelism” and surely not the “left” against the “right,” but the issue of radical discipleship. Two major addresses, both by Latin Americans who are involved with evangelism among university students, became the focus of the controversy. René Padilla’s “Evangelism and the World” and Samuel Escobar’s “Evangelism and Man’s Search for Freedom, Justice, and Fulfilment” agreed in insisting that the gospel is not neutral with respect to culture. To them the message was more than “believe and be saved.”

Instead of building on existing social structures and cultural patterns, Padilla and Escobar said, the gospel must challenge society at every level, condemning injustice and changing what needs to be changed. Social action is *not* “stage two” in the process of Christianization. Certainly it is not a mere option for some who are interested. It is itself an essential aspect of biblical evangelism. By evangelism we should not understand simply an invitation for “souls” to come and be saved, but a call to take up the cross and follow Jesus in radical discipleship

(including commitment to social action), both individually and as the church.

The views of Padilla and Escobar sounded like an echo of the theme verses for the Congress from Luke 4: “. . . to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised.” If these two men represented the “left wing” of this evangelical Congress, it was only because they were more willing than others to say some things which WCC delegates had also said at Bangkok. But in a deeper sense they were the “conservatives,” for it was they who insisted on the “whole counsel of God.” They saw little virtue in flexibility. The church had in fact become so “flexible,” both in the United States and in Latin America, that it was in danger of virtual captivity to its culture and to the dominant political systems.

Padilla denounced for their “worldliness” both the “secular Christianity” represented by some in the World Council of Churches, and the “cultural Christianity” which results when the gospel is equated with Americanism. On the first of these concerns, he had virtually all the Lausanne participants on his side; over the second he became perhaps the single most controversial person at the Congress. Both he and Escobar had stepped on some toes, especially American ones, among Congress participants. But when the revised final draft of the Lausanne Covenant appeared, it was clear that their views, reinforced by written comments from many and by a caucus among younger participants on radical discipleship, had been heard, and that an effort had been made to incorporate some of these concerns into the final statement. The document that emerged was long and somewhat unwieldy, partly a creed and partly a statement on evangelism, inconsistent with itself at many points, and yet despite these shortcomings much the better for its generally honest attempt to reflect the complexity of the issues.

* * *

The second polarity which surfaced at the Congress was between the West and the Third World.

Lausanne ’74 had been publicized as a conference in which Third World representation would be greater than in any such convocation before. Looking at and listening to those around me, I had no reason to doubt that this was the case. And yet it was equally clear that the impetus and planning for the Congress, the financing of it and therefore most of the decision-making responsibility, lay with Westerners, and with Americans in particular.

Despite the headsets and the hard-working interpreters, there was still a certain imperialism of the English language. Most speakers whose second language was English spoke English instead of their native tongue (Escobar, Padilla, and France's Henri Blocher were exceptions). Participants who knew no English at all found themselves extremely handicapped in the seminar groups. The final draft of the Covenant, which all participants were invited to sign, appeared only in English. The songs in the program book were without exception familiar to Americans. Almost everything, in fact, seemed designed for their convenience. One German participant remarked with irony that to him the "unreached people" were not the heathen millions throughout the world but the planners, conveners, and speakers at the front of the auditorium, who seemed so remote from the individual participants. Few Americans could identify with his feelings; there was little reason why they should.

As for the Third World participants, generalizations are hazardous. Many echoed almost exactly the theology and missionary strategies of their counterparts in the West. Indeed, some of the most outspoken criticisms of Padilla and Escobar, and some of the strongest pro-Western sentiments, came from Third World delegates. This was not surprising; many of the Third World leaders had received their theological education in the West, and almost all were dependent in some way on American or European mission boards, whether for money, educational and technical assistance, or spiritual counsel. But a few spoke out for more independence from Western control.

John Gatu of Kenya, chairman of the All-African Conference of Churches, had earlier called for a "moratorium" on missionaries from the West. He was not invited to address the Congress, and his proposal was seldom mentioned without a certain defensiveness, or even outright disavowal. Finally the Congress newspaper faced the issue at least to the extent of interviewing Gatu. He did not press the term "moratorium" but pleaded for less dependence of African churches on external missionary control. Although he expressed himself in terms of the need for Africans to *accept* more responsibility, implicit in his concern was the need for Western missionaries to be willing to *give* more responsibility. The intent of the article, and perhaps Gatu's intent as well, was to cool a potentially divisive issue, but behind the conciliatory language the issue remained unresolved.

Reflecting on the West and the Third World, I was amazed at how easy it is for the Christian missionary enterprise to become an "establishment," a "vested

interest," with something to lose when God starts to work in new ways. My impression (confirmed by many with whom I talked) was that what much of the world now needs from the United States is not so much missionaries as money—*with* prayer but *without* strings. The human resources are already there, in Latin America, in Africa, in much of Asia, for the task of evangelization. Francis Schaeffer was correct, I thought, in calling for "the compassionate use of accumulated wealth." But the problem comes with the American passion always to be in control. To give money without strings to non-Westerners is to risk mistakes, and Americans like to have the privilege of insuring that any mistakes made are their own.

Much was said at Lausanne about faith and prayer, and the power of the Holy Spirit. These familiar concepts may have to take on an awesome practicality if Americans are going to fulfil their responsibility in world evangelization. Are we ready to trust the Holy Spirit to work even when *we* are not in control? Are we willing to step aside and let him work through others when the time comes? Are we willing to re-deploy some of our missionaries to places where Westerners are still needed? These were the long-range questions which Lausanne raised for me as an American Christian. More important, however, for participants from the various Third World countries was the opportunity Lausanne afforded them to meet each other, to share their common problems and begin to draw on one another's resources. Ironically, it was often their common knowledge of English as a second language which made such communication possible.

* * *

A third issue at the Congress can be partially defined in terms of the polarity between clergy and laity.

The very fact that one evening was set apart as a "laymen's panel" pointed up the dominance of the clergy as spokesmen both for Western and Third World churches throughout most of the Congress. Theologically, a fine paper by Howard Snyder of the Free Methodist Seminary in Brazil laid the basis for a biblical understanding of the church as the body of Christ and of evangelization as the responsibility of the whole body, not merely a few trained professionals. Historically, Michael Green of England showed how, in the ancient church, evangelism followed as the inevitable result of the commitment of all the people of God to the gospel message which had transformed their lives. And Juan Carlos Ortiz of Faith Tabernacle (Assemblies of God) in Buenos

Aires demonstrated in an interview how even today this biblical pattern of "body life" can renew and transform a local congregation.

Yet despite all this, Lausanne reminded me that we are still a long way from the ideal, often expressed, of "the whole church bringing the whole gospel to the whole world." Women, for example, though represented in modest numbers as participants, seemed to have almost no meaningful voice at the Congress. The careless sexism which plagues evangelical Christianity was still in evidence at Lausanne and no one seemed to much mind. "Men of God Arrive in Lausanne With High Expectations," announced the newspaper headlines the very first day, and even my untrained male eye took notice, but with more amusement than alarm. I remembered the young seminarian with whom I had shared the bus ride.

Near the end of the Congress, the planning committee suggested the names of twenty-five individuals who might represent the United States on a "continuation committee" to make plans for the future. Only one was a woman, and while the others were designated "pastor," "theologian" or "educator," she was designated simply as "woman." By this time it was clear that the trivial things were really not so trivial, but symptomatic of a blind spot somewhere. All talk of the enormity of the worldwide missionary task seemed a little hollow in the face of this failure of the church adequately to mobilize over half its membership, because of effectively denying them access to decision-making responsibility.

The absence of Roman Catholic representation at Lausanne, whether as participants or observers, was another cause for regret. The task was urgent, we were told, and the hour late, but apparently not so urgent or so late as to necessitate the building of even one small bridge to another major segment of the Christian church. Whether in relation to Rome or Geneva, Lausanne was more of a tower or an enclave than a bridge. It was a show of strength, and the strength was considerable.

* * *

Often it is easier to pick flaws than to pinpoint the positive values of an event like Lausanne '74. But the one strength which stands out above all else is simply the people who were there. They were beautiful people, many of them, and each one had a story to tell. In hundreds of different ways, they were telling the good news of Jesus Christ. One of the most effective presentations of the entire Congress was Stanley Mooneyham's multi-media portrayal of "Acts of the Holy Spirit '74," simply

Could Americans
be the
"unreached
millions?"

because it took some of these personal stories of faith at work, the kind that were being exchanged over the dinner tables, and presented them to all of us on a large scale in plenary session.

Theologically, the strength of Lausanne was its optimism. Protestant liberals, when confronted with the seemingly hopeless task of evangelizing the world's growing population, simply re-defined their task and in effect declared evangelism obsolete. But the people at Lausanne really believed that the job could be done, and had statistics to show that in places it was being done. Dents were being made, even in the face of awesome population growth. There was no need to conquer by re-definition, for God was at work, and they gladly exchanged stories that celebrated his power and love. Only two speakers, Harold Lindell and Malcolm Muggeridge, struck a more pessimistic note, but their remarks seemed not to capture the mood of most participants. Muggeridge's wit and subtle well-turned phrases lent style to the occasion, but must have been a nightmare for translators and those to whom English was a second language.

Through it all the question remains, What has been accomplished? Was Lausanne worth the \$3.3 million it was said to have cost? Plans are already under way for some kind of fellowship of evangelical churches and para-church organizations throughout the world, and perhaps future congresses to continue discussion and strategy planning. Whether the result will be further polarization *vis-à-vis* the World Council and the Vatican, or whether this show of strength is simply a necessary prelude to the building of some bridges, remains to be seen.

Perhaps some day a congress of Third World Christians, with Westerners present only as observers, will make its own show of strength, set its own agenda, and launch the Christian mission into an altogether new and exciting phase. Nothing of the sort is on the drawing boards, and it may be an idle dream, but Lausanne at least demonstrated that the potential is there. More important than what happened at Lausanne is what happens now.

PATRICIA HEARST/TANIA and a theology of the family

WAYNE G. BOULTON

A most striking aspect of the Patricia Hearst kidnaping is her ambivalence toward her family. On February 12 she was a daughter wrenched from the family matrix, anxious to get back to it:

Mom, Dad, I'm OK. . . . I'm not being starved or beaten or unnecessarily frightened. . . . I know that Steve is OK. . . . I heard that Mom is really upset and that everybody is at home. . . . I hope this puts you a little bit at ease. . . . I just hope I can get back to everybody real soon.

On June 6, she is standing squarely against her family, indeed against her whole life up to this point. Her taped voice is cool and defiant:

I still feel strong and am determined to fight. . . . The brainwash-duress theory of the pig Hearsts has always amused me. . . . I would never choose to live the rest of my life surrounded by pigs like the Hearsts.

No one has noticed that there is a clear sense in which Patricia Hearst may be right *in both cases*. The biblical position on the family is also ambivalent, profoundly so, and in ways not that much different from Tania's. Her transformation may, indeed, be tragic, as it involves the choice between two high but contradicting values—filial piety and justice for all. But it may be neither as surprising nor as confusing as is generally assumed.

* * *

The Bible is notoriously and incontrovertibly supportive of the traditional family structure. The evidence of scriptural conservatism on this point is overwhelming. "Keep your father's commandment," children are told in Proverbs 6:

Forsake not your mother's teaching. . . .
When you walk, they will lead you;
When you lie down, they will watch over you;
And when you awake, they will talk with you.

"Fear the Lord," promises the Psalmist.

Your wife will be like a fruitful wine
within your house;
Your children will be like olive shoots
around your table. . . .
May you see your children's children! (Psalm 128)

And everyone knows the Fifth Commandment.

The thrust of the entire Old Testament on this subject, especially the Psalms and Proverbs, is to place family life under the category of divine "*blessing*." No study of the biblical position on the family is adequate without penetration and examination of this claim. A blessing is a special gift of God; the Hebrews used the word to indicate that something had been revealed to them about the nature and origin of a phenomenon. To interpret family life as a blessing meant that it was essentially good and grounded in mystery, that its growth and dissolution, in other words, could be neither fully understood nor manipulated by man.

This celebration of the family reaches full flower in the New Testament, where Jesus, against the laxity of his time, demands an austere purity in marriage (which startled even his disciples—Matt. 19) and categorically denies the validity of divorce (Mark 10; Luke 16). His entire theology could be described as a transfiguration of the family. Indeed, its most surprising and resounding New Testament affirmation lies behind this in the fact of the Incarnation itself: God decides to become man in a family. That this event is *still* surprising is reflected in the controversy surrounding the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.

Alas, to a modern egalitarian, nearly all of the evidence, particularly from the Old Testament, is patently "authoritarian" and "male chauvinist." God is the *Father*; the husband's role is consistently interpreted as different from that of the wife and as carrying with it a special authority; children are usually considered essential to marital fulfillment; homosexuality is condemned; warnings about loose *women* abound, apparently encouraging some kind of double standard.

Christian intellectuals have usually responded to such charges in one of two ways. Some have argued that the Bible, though authoritative as a whole, doesn't really commend what it says; these arguments are refuted handily by the evidence. Others suggest a more critical Christian posture toward the traditional family by overlooking or relativizing the full biblical witness, creating credibility and identity problems. So neither way works. The charges stick.

In his *Nun, Witch, Playmate: The Americaniza-*

tion of Sex (1971), Herbert Richardson resolves the difficulty *via* Hegel. The Hebrews were indeed male-oriented, he writes; nevertheless their legal-covenantal sexual norms produced socially creative institutions *at that time*. Israelite patriarchy represents a step forward in the "evolution of sexual consciousness," enabling ancient Hebrew males to develop their ego-consciousness by separating themselves from and then subordinating the female with her formidable sexual power. This step forward unfortunately involved reducing women to an inferior status in the "patriarchal family" of the Hebrew Scriptures—a model for family life now outdated and being replaced by a revolutionary, spiritualistic Protestant "democratic family."

Richardson's theory satisfies few, of course. Conservatives suspect that an evolutionary scheme, not Scripture, is his real authority, and they appear to be correct. Feminist Alice Hageman spews the book out of her mouth, wondering aloud how any project can be termed a "step forward" which involves the systematic subjugation of one half of humanity by the other.

The logic behind the intense preoccupation of the biblical writers with a particular kind of family is so simple and obvious that the incapacity of most modern interpreters to perceive it is remarkable. The evolutionary hypothesis has done us a disservice here. To see this position as one stage in a developmental process, or as a transparent rationalization for a male-oriented social structure is to miss the point.

The biblical writers were for the most part interested in only two subjects: God, and the nature of faith in him. Their intent everywhere is to describe, commend, and defend faith—a vision of God at work in the world, a disposition of man's whole being toward him, trust in him, and the like. Long before it was rediscovered by Freud, they knew of the intimate connection between religious faith and sexual life: the biblical preoccupation with sexual experience would make no sense if they didn't. Sexual desire must be sternly regulated and controlled, they were convinced, or else the whole personality could become intoxicated, undermining faith. The *Confessions* of St. Augustine provide vivid illustrations here. It is not at all a question of prudishness, so-called Puritanism, or looking the other way. On the contrary, in contrast with most alternative approaches, the outstanding characteristic of the Bible on this subject is its lack of guarded language. The biblical writers knew exactly what they were doing.

They knew also of the relation between the growth of this disposition called faith and what goes

on in a child's earliest years. In childhood, education is more than mere learning. Apparently it is here, usually before puberty, that a person's basic dispositions are fixed, his forms of seeing shaped, his character molded. What grows into one's basic vision of the authority and order of the world usually reflects approximately the model presented by his parents. The focus of the biblical writers on family life, then, particularly during the years of childhood, is not at all difficult to understand. If faith in God is faith in a being who is wiser and stronger than man, whose will is not identical with man's but on the contrary is to be obeyed, who creates and loves each unique individual—if all this is true, then to encourage faith certain models of family life commend themselves.

* * *

So where is the ambivalence in the biblical posture? We have yet to tell the whole story. To equate what has been stated thus far with the biblical position on the family would be to propagate heresy in the classical sense. It would be presenting part of the truth as the whole truth. In the history of social thought, there is a persistent, minority view on the subject.

Beginning with Plato and continuing into the modern period, a utopian-eschatological tradition has emerged which is radically critical of the natural family. At its heart is the conviction that the relation between the family and social order is almost always misconceived. The fundamental issue is not the responsibility of society for the disintegration of the family, but rather the responsibility of the family for the disintegration of society. Advocates of the natural family say, "Outside the family, children would never learn to love and be loved." The utopian tradition answers: "In the family, children are loved by and learn to love *people like themselves*, reinforcing racial prejudice, class hostility, and nationalism. Social disintegration will be checked not by supporting the family, but by abolishing it."

"Abolish the family!" wrote Marx and Engels in *The Communist Manifesto* (1847-48), perhaps the best-known representative statement of this tradition. "Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists." But the families everyone defends are located in the middle class; modern industry is systematically destroying families in the working classes, and no one objects. Furthermore, the sacralization of the middle-class family masks the exploitation of women within it, leading Marx and Engels to ridicule the bourgeois charge that the Communists will introduce a community of women.

The Bible sees the family as an arena of God's special grace...

He [the bourgeois] has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as the mere instruments of production in society. . . . The communists have no need to introduce a community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial. Our bourgeois, not content with . . . common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each others' wives. Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common and thus, at the most, what the communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce . . . an openly legalized community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system . . . (pp. 34f.).

Hostility to the traditional family structure in actual operation and in its social effects is a posture that does not originate with Marx and Engels. It can be found in Plato's *Republic*. The Bible picks up this tradition and transforms it in a distinctive way. The anti-family dimension of the biblical position is represented best perhaps in the monastic tradition of Roman Catholicism, and in some contemporary mutations of monasticism such as the Shakers, the Mormons, and the Children of God. The strength of Richardson's book, incidentally, is the attention he gives to this eschatological side of the biblical tradition.

Again, the key category is the notion of blessing. In the ancient pre-Israelite conceptions of blessing, magic was the key element. Blessing involved an alliance between certain men and superhuman forces. Essentially it was a religious technique for avoiding bad fortune and for managing the future. To have a marriage or a family "blessed" was a way of teaming up with the powers that determined the outcome of family life, of ensuring marital bliss, of turning nasty relatives into nice ones, an effective hedge against disintegration or tragedy.

The Hebraic blessing stands in grand and awesome opposition to this conception. It is contra-magical at its core. Emphasizing the break with ancient theory, the Old Testament speaks constantly (as in Ps. 128:8, referring to family life) of God pronouncing the blessing himself. We may note four facets of this for the Hebrews.

(1) Whenever family life is good, fulfilling, fruitful, "blessed," it is God who is behind it no matter what other causes appear to be ultimately effective.

(2) Human beings, therefore, have no final control over the success or failure of family life, for God's blessing is decisive here, and the God of whom the Hebrews speak is not at man's disposal (Job 38-42). Does the family that prays together stay together? Perhaps, *but not because they pray together*.

(3) Though it may be the occasion for the most exalted moments of intimacy and brotherhood and equality, there is nothing sacred about the family *per se*. Its goodness and power are real but derivative, and its sacralization (the tendency to place it beyond searching and radical criticism) must be everywhere resisted *in the name of God*.

(4) Family life does not describe an exclusive realm with its own powers and principalities. All of life, private and public, is of a piece. The attempt to divorce issues of family life from issues of social and political health is forced and usually fraudulent, for the God of the family and the God of the Hebrew prophets is the same God.

In the New Testament this side of the tradition is elaborated further. It is revealed there that the family is not the communal goal of life but a *shadow* of the goal. It is like the end, not itself the end. In the New Testament, the natural family is basically a *community of preparation*, preparation for a new community where blood and sex and social status are no longer the basis for communion. A new family, a *koinonia*, is revealed to be groaning in travail, struggling to be born (Rom. 8). In Jesus of Nazareth, said the apostle Paul, the end has come: in him there is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, *male nor female* (Gal. 3).

This meant that some harsh things had to be said to those who wanted to hold onto the natural family as something more than preparation. The problem was and is that precisely those people who understand the deep significance of the family—that it is the arena of God's special grace—are the most tempted to idolize it and invest it with independent significance. This is why Jesus on occasion was so sharply critical of it: "If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14). "My

...but refuses to
sentimentalize it
or place it
above criticism

mother and brothers? They are the ones who hear the Word of God and do it" (Luke 8).

* * *

On the subject of the family at least, Tania and the Bible are not far apart. The deep ambivalence of the latter is echoed in the dramatic transformation of the former. In a word, to be truly for the family is at the same time to be against it. The social implications of such a position are complicated, but can be summarized as a double negative or as a call to a double resistance.

(1) *There are no grounds whatever for hating the natural family.* Patty is right, Tania is wrong. As we have seen, Luke 14:26 ("If anyone comes to me and does not hate . . .") is best understood within the context of the Bible as a whole, not apart from it. Tania's disillusion with the matrix that has sustained her, shaped her, and without which she would never have survived veers dangerously close to self-hate and flies in the face of the biblical understanding of Creation. With Marx, she dreams of a world *humans can create* where conventional family life, with all its pitfalls, will be absent. But what is the basis of the dream? The Bible tells of no such world; the history of our planet knows of no such world. On the contrary, the Bible understands the family as an arena of God's special grace, a structure which prefigures the end or goal of human life.

To promote policies that undermine the family as an institution is nothing less, then, than a kind of suicide. George Gilder makes this point well, if a bit aggressively, in his explosive *Sexual Suicide* (1973). When part of the book first appeared as an article in *Harper's* (July 1973), it promoted the largest mail response, pro and con, in the recent history of the magazine.

Gilder's understanding of the family is not too different from the biblical one: a mysterious matrix of sexual love, intercourse, marriage, conception of a child, child-bearing, and child-rearing. He argues that almost every social disorder—violence, drug and welfare addiction, crime—is connected with familial disintegration. Women's, gay, and other liberation movements attack the traditional family on the assumption that it perpetuates differences they wish to eliminate. But the natural family not only perpetuates these differences (between male and female roles and realms), Gilder writes; it is *based* on them. To undermine their social structural support—

rewarding welfare payments regardless of familial role or employment, for example—is usually to undermine the family itself. This is why the liberationist cure is often worse than the problem it purports to solve. For all its weaknesses, the natural family is the keystone of every civilized society, a bastion of human privacy and individuality. Any social policy that weakens family ties even to implement "social justice" is dubious and calls for careful examination and, frequently, resistance.

(2) *There are no grounds whatever for sacralizing the family.* Tania's defiance suggests the truth here, reflecting something of the biblical refusal to sentimentalize family life or to place it above criticism. The power and limits of the family are revealed nicely in Mario Puzo's *The Godfather* (1969), where loyalty to the family structure is at once essential to survival and the continuing source of massive and unnecessary violence. In an otherwise profound section on the church in the modern world, *The Documents of Vatican II* (1967) includes continued references to "the sanctity of family life" and "the sacred bonds of the family" (pp. 250ff.). Here is precisely where Marx and Jesus walk together, away from Confucius. The authors of the document have chosen Confucius. The impulse to sacralize the family—whether in Gilder's book, in the *Analects*, or on *Apple's Way*—must be constantly resisted and criticized.

* * *

The biblical position on the family is marked by a fundamental tension and ambivalence. Typically, the tendency is to overlook its subtlety and embrace either the pro- or the anti-family component. To use Luther's image, the problem is a little like trying to get a drunken peasant on a horse: you push him up on one side, and he falls off on the other.

Or as the ancients said, there is a Scylla and a Charybdis. If the Scylla is emphasizing Creation and the past or present to the point of idolatry and worship of the family, the Charybdis is emphasizing eschatology and the future to the point of Manichean dualism. The trick theologically is to affirm Patty and Tania at the same time. It is to avoid rejecting the God of continuity for the God of discontinuity (as in much of the theology of hope), or vice-versa. The dilemma is a false one. What must be rejected is *both of these rejections* in the name of the God who was *and is and is to come*.

FREEDOM in KOREA today

KAREN DE VOS

The government of a democratic, freedom-loving country must maintain a balance between freedom and control. At one end of the balance is freedom of the press and of elections, freedom to criticize the government, to demonstrate, to organize opposition. At the other end is the need for strong measures to protect the national security and to avoid economic disaster.

South Korea in 1974 is a case study of how this delicate balance can be tipped by the determination of a strong leader. Most Western observers, from the reporter of the *New York Times* to evangelical Christian missionaries,* believe that President Park, Chung Hee has tipped the balance far to the side of suppression and dictatorship.

The facts of the case are not in dispute. Early in 1972, in the wake of student demonstrations, "incidents" with North Korea, and other turbulent events, President Park suspended the constitution under which Korea had been operating since 1964 and dissolved the National Assembly. A new constitution was instituted, which gave the President the right to nominate one-third of the members of the National Assembly, with the other two-thirds being chosen by regular elections. The new constitution also gave the President the right to suspend constitutional law in an emergency. Such emergencies have cropped up frequently, resulting, among other things, in decrees (among others) that make it illegal to spread rumors and illegal to organize opposition to the new constitution.

In mid-1973 the kidnapping of Kim, Dae Jung threatened to undo the "peace" that Park had instituted. The opposition political leader disappeared from a Tokyo hotel room, mysteriously reappeared at his home in Seoul five days later, was held under house arrest for several months, and then reappeared, an uncommunicative man.

That incident played a part in a rebellion that broke out in November 1973. Students, newspaper editors, and political opposition leaders joined in verbal assault and demonstrations demanding an ex-

planation of the Kim, Dae Jung incident, a reversal of Japanese economic domination, and restoration of freedoms wiped out by 1972's martial law and new constitution.

Park's response was to close the universities and colleges (ostensibly to conserve fuel), to reshuffle his cabinet (getting rid of the man who was suspected of having engineered the Kim, Dae Jung affair), and to come out with several strong statements intimating that further toleration of dissidents in the Republic was impossible.

Park has been able to maintain that stance. Dissidence is not being tolerated. Since many of the repressive decrees are "emergency military measures," those who oppose them are tried by court-martial rather than by civilian courts. The government admits to having made 1024 arrests under an April 3 decree banning dissent.

An American missionary tells the story of one of Park's victims, evangelist Kim, Jin Hong, pastor of a small church in Seoul. Pastor Kim has long been a social activist, having sold his own home to build a sturdy but crude church building in one of Seoul's "unthinkably poor" communities. Pastor Kim paid a fine and served a brief jail sentence for failing to get a building permit when he expanded the church, but nonetheless he continued his work. In addition to a worship center, the church became a place where community meetings, medical clinics, and social groups could take place.

Early this year Pastor Kim was sentenced to *fifteen years* in prison. His crime: working to collect one million signatures on a petition to revoke the 1972 constitution. Meanwhile, his wife continues working in the church community, being supported by gifts quietly given by sympathetic Christians.

Pastor Kim is only one of many Christians who have been arrested, jailed, fined, sentenced to ten, fifteen, twenty years for their opposition to the Park regime. The *New York Times* reported that "Christian activists working with labor unions and in the slums are particular suspects." One western missionary claimed that "there is no organized effort to persecute the Christians. . . . What has become obvious is that Christians are most likely to be in the vanguard of those groups who still dare express

*Much of the information for this article was provided by a former resident of Seoul who was engaged in missionary service there until recently. He has asked to remain anonymous.

disagreement with and disapproval of a freedom-squelching government." The *New York Times* of Sunday, May 5, carried a full-page advertisement printing a "Manifesto of Korean Christians by Christian Ministers in the Republic of Korea." Its charges were that "The present dictatorship is destroying rule by law and persuasion . . . freedom of conscience and freedom of religious belief . . . is using systematic deception, manipulation, and indoctrination to control the people . . . sinister and inhuman methods and ruthless means to destroy political opponents . . . is responsible for the present economic system in which the powerful dominate the poor . . . is using the current unification talks only to preserve its own power." The Most Rev. Daniel Chi Hak Soun, a prominent Catholic bishop, was arrested on charges of subversion after he issued a statement denouncing "violence, intimidation and fraud" on the part of President Park. His trial was postponed after two thousand Catholics, including ambassadors from European countries, staged a protest rally.

* * *

All of these facts are not in dispute. The real issue is whether such actions by the Park regime are justified by the needs of the Korean people. The issue was joined, again in the *New York Times*, on June 16, 1974, when the *Times* accused the Korean government of arresting political dissidents, operating with secrecy and repression, censoring the press, and keeping suspected dissenters under surveillance. Two weeks later the *Times* printed a letter from the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea which purported to answer the charges. He stated only one disagreement with the facts cited by the *Times*: his government, he said, had never claimed that "freedom is a luxury that South Korea cannot now afford." But without denying any of the *Times'* other charges, he went on to say that Korea's economic growth under the "dynamic leadership of President Park" has been phenomenal, that "isolated events" such as the Kim, Dae Jung case should not be allowed to "blur the many other achievements" of this administration, that the *Times* engaged in "one-sided comments by self-appointed, ritualistic liberals and academicians who are often indifferent to the hard realities that face the developing countries," that Korea "needs continuing political stability if it is to remain effective in containing the threat of Communist North Korea. . . ."

There it is, in the proverbial nutshell: *dictatorial rule and suppression of political dissent are justified by economic needs, the "hard realities that face the developing countries," and by the need for "polit-*

ical stability," in this case in the face of what some westerners in Korea believe to be a genuine threat from the Communist North. And, of course, the ultimate argument is: "You don't understand" or "you don't have the facts."

President Park used much the same arguments in an interview published in the *National Review* (May 24, 1974). "We need stability and unity . . . to deal with the many critical problems . . . including both the energy crisis and Communist subversion." And, "Ours is a strong presidential system. . . . In many . . . respects, however, it is uniquely Korean." There it is again, the same insistence on the need for economic stability, unity against subversion, and the suggestion that only those in the know can understand the situation.

One or all of these excuses have been used to justify villainy in many governments. Americans, fresh from their Watergate experience, recognize all too plainly the possible misuse of "national security," and from the Vietnam years, the insistence that "only the President knows all the facts." And now we are reminded by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn of the importance that unity in the face of economic need played in official justifications of the mass arrests of the Stalin era.

The reason the excuses work so well, of course, is that there is some truth in them. Nations have genuine security needs. And the economic facts of life in Korea may demand extraordinary measures of some sort. While the Ambassador is right that the economic growth of Korea in recent years has been phenomenal, he failed to mention the runaway inflation that is threatening to destroy many of the gains. The government admits to an annual inflation rate of 22%; westerners living in Seoul estimate that inflation, in that city at least, is more like 40% a year. In a country where many people spend half of their monthly incomes on rice, the price of rice has nearly doubled in the last year. Korea imports 100% of her petroleum needs, and the recent price hikes have severely hurt her economy.

While the balance between freedom and stability is never easy to maintain, President Park of Korea has obviously tipped that balance far to the side of oppression and control. A fifteen-year prison term imposed for collecting signatures on a petition is inconsistent with Park's talk about "working hard to build our house in our own democratic and constitutional way" (*National Review*). The kidnapping of a major political leader by some one or some group within the government cannot be dismissed as an "isolated event" by representatives of a government that "love[s] freedom for its flexible, rational, and humane principles" (Park). For whatever reasons—

whether to maintain his own power or out of genuine but mistaken concern for his country—President Park has chosen to suppress dissent and honest disagreement, to use means other than persuasion to bring about his goals for his nation.

Korean Christians are in the vanguard of those opposing that tilt in the balance. That a mere 7% of the Korean population should be able to tell the world that in Korea, at least, Christians care about justice and equality and freedom, is heartwarming, and, perhaps, shaming as well. For in the United

States, which claims a much larger percentage of Christians, a larger percentage even of evangelical Christians, the voice of the Christian church is seldom heard so clearly, so loudly, and so courageously about any political or social issue.

The brave Korean Christians who issued the “Manifesto” ended by addressing “to the Christians of the world” this call: “Most of all we need your prayers and solidarity, and we ask you to express our common bond through actions of encouragement and support.”

CHESTERTON: a century later

MIDGE SHERWOOD

It is exactly when the world claims it is too complex for Christianity that Christianity becomes most relevant to the world, according to Gilbert Keith Chesterton. The journalist who saw the Victorian sunset and the dawn of the Twentieth Century from a window on Fleet Street once wrote that “the complication of our modern world proves the truth of the creed more perfectly than any of the plain problems of the ages of faith.”

By way of analogy, Chesterton noted that while a lock and key are both complex, “if a key fits the lock, you know it is the right key.” Somewhat by accident, in an unexpected collision with some of the most astute atheists, agnostics, and dialectical materialists of the century, Chesterton discovered that Christianity is the right key that opens the door of the mind to solution and the final absolution of Christ himself: “*Father, forgive them. . .*”

Chesterton doggedly followed every thought through to its logical conclusion. “It is the very multiplicity of proof” that makes defense of the creed so difficult, he wrote. There is in all complete conviction “a kind of huge helplessness.” Nevertheless he wrote nearly a hundred books of essays (which he called articles), fiction, mystery, poetry, and plays, which may yet turn out to be one of the best collections of Christian apologetics in our time.

This is unusual for several reasons. For one thing, Chesterton was a journalist, a “*mere* journalist,” he insisted, even when receiving an honorary degree from Notre Dame in 1930. Born a hundred years ago, he set out to be an artist, graduating from Slade Art School in 1895. Motivated partly by his friends and partly by his own proclivity for the written word, he wrote more than he illustrated. In 1900 he

began writing book reviews and columns for the *London News*. During the next 36 years, and until his death, he turned out regular columns for several London newspapers, finally including his own *G. K.’s Weekly*, to become one of the most popular journalists on Fleet Street.

That a secular journalist should have developed into a defender of the faith may seem even more unusual in the face of Kierkegaard’s pronouncement that “the lowest depth to which people can sink before God is defined by the word journalist.” Chesterton’s work is a monument to Kierkegaard’s impatience. Describing himself as a young agnostic who began to “doubt the doubters,” G. K. literally wrote himself into the Christian faith.

He clashed first with Robert Blatchford, social determinist, avowed enemy of Christianity, and leading spokesman for both points of view as editor of the *Clarion*. After several exchanges in which G. K. neatly dispatched the atheist socialist’s arguments for evolution and against God, Blatchford announced to Fleet Street: “I will begin to worry about my philosophy when Mr. Chesterton has given us his.”

It was “an incautious suggestion to make to a person only too ready to write books upon the feeblest provocation.” As the result, G. K. wrote *Orthodoxy* in 1908 to attempt an explanation, not of whether the Christian faith can be believed, but of how he personally had come to believe it.

* * *

“I will not call it my philosophy,” he wrote in the opening paragraph of *Orthodoxy*, “for I did not make it. God and humanity made it; and it made me.” G. K. compared his spiritual odyssey with that

of the English yachtsman who "slightly miscalculated his course and discovered England under the impression that it was a new island in the South Seas."

I am the man who with the utmost daring discovered what had been discovered before. . . . I did, like all other solemn little boys, try to be in advance of the age. Like them I tried to be some ten minutes in advance of the truth. And I found that I was eighteen hundred years behind it. . . . The man from the yacht thought he was the first to find England. I thought I was the first to find Europe. I did try to find a heresy of my own; and when I had put the last touches to it, I discovered that it was orthodoxy.

Chesterton defined orthodoxy as the Apostles' Creed—"understood by everybody calling himself Christian until a very short time ago—and the general historic conduct of those who held such a creed." He succinctly delineated determinism as opposed to free will; belief in one's self or Superman as opposed to belief in God; and the waiving of sins (beyond good and evil) as opposed to the forgiveness of sins. He defined tradition as democracy extended through time to give our ancestors the vote, agnosticism as simple ignorance, law as "something that can be broken," love as a thing "bound, not blind," and pessimism as "the unpardonable sin"—for, he said, "the test of true happiness is gratitude."

"According to most philosophers," he wrote, "God in making the world enslaved it. According to Christianity, in making it, He set it free. God had written, not so much a poem, but rather a play; a play he had planned as perfect, but which had necessarily been left to human actors and stage-managers, who had since made a mess of it."

In this light G. K. suddenly began to see the whole:

It was as if I had been blundering about since my birth with two huge and unmanageable machines, of different shapes and without apparent connection—the world and the Christian tradition. I had found this hole in the world: the fact that one must somehow find a way of loving the world without trusting it; somehow one must love the world without being worldly. I found this projecting feature of Christian theology like a sort of hard spike, the dogmatic insistence that God was personal, and had made a world separate from Himself. The spike of dogma fitted exactly into the hole in the world—it had evidently been meant to go there—and then the strange thing began to happen. When once these two parts of the two machines had come together, one after another, all the other parts fitted and fell in with eerie exactitude. I could hear bolt after bolt over all the machinery falling into its place with a kind of click of

relief. Having got one part right, all the other parts were repeating that rectitude, as clock after clock strikes noon. Instinct after instinct was answered by doctrine after doctrine.

G. K. had found freedom at last in his Creator God.

"I had tried to be happy," he said, "by telling myself that man is an animal, like any other which sought its meat from God. But now I really was happy, for I had learnt that man is a monstrosity . . . at once worse and better than all things. The optimist's pleasure was prosaic, for it dwelt on the naturalness of everything; the Christian pleasure was poetic, for it dwelt on the unnaturalness of everything in the light of the supernatural."

* * *

The next step in Chesterton's spiritual voyage established his genius for Christian paradox. He discovered that the attacks of the skeptics were a series of contradictions. Stirred by "the eloquent attack on Christianity as a thing of inhuman gloom . . ." he "was quite prepared to blow up St. Paul's Cathedral." But after proving to him in Chapter I that Christianity was too pessimistic the skeptics proceeded in Chapter II to prove that it was far too optimistic. Swinburne's taunt was well known: "Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilaeen, the world has grown gray with Thy breath." But when Chesterton read the poet's account of paganism, he gathered "that the world was, if possible, more gray before the Galilaeen breathed on it than afterwards. . . . The very man who denounced Christianity for pessimism was himself a pessimist." Perhaps, concluded G. K., "those might not be the very best judges of the relation of religion to happiness who, by their own account, had neither one nor the other."

"The Gospel paradox about the other cheek, the fact that priests never fought, a hundred things made plausible the accusation that Christianity was an attempt to make a man too like a sheep. I read it and believed it." Then, he said, he turned the next page in his agnostic manual to find "that I was to hate Christianity not for fighting too little, but for fighting too much. Christianity, it seemed, was the mother of wars."

Thoroughly angry with the Christian because he never was angry, G. K. was now told to be angry with him "because his anger has soaked the earth and smoked the sun." "It was the fault of poor old Christianity (somehow or other) that Edward the Confessor did not fight and that Richard Coeur de Leon did. . . . What could it all mean?"

Chesterton also found a paradox in the "daily

taunt against Christianity that it was the light of one people and had left all others to die in the dark.”

“But I also found that it was their special boast for themselves that science and progress were the discovery of one people, and that all other people had died in the dark. Their chief insult to Christianity was actually their chief compliment to themselves, and there seemed to be a strange unfairness about it all.”

Some skeptics insisted that the great crime of the creed had been its attack on the family, while others (“slightly more advanced”) said that its great crime was in forcing family and marriage upon us.

Or again: “Christianity was reproached with its naked and hungry habit; with its sackcloth and dried peas. But the next minute, Christianity was reproached with its pomp and its ritualism; its shrines of porphyry and its robes of gold. It was abused for being too plain and for being too coloured.”

While many skeptics accused Christianity of restraining sexuality too much, along came Bradlaugh, the Malthusian, who accused it of restraining sex too little.

“Between the covers of the same atheistic pamphlet,” said G. K., “I have found the faith rebuked for its disunion, ‘One thinks one thing, and one another,’ and rebuked also for its union, ‘It is difference of opinion that prevents the world from going to the dogs.’ In the same conversation a freethinker, a friend of mine, blamed Christianity for despising Jews, and then despised it himself for being Jewish.”

Finally, concluded G. K., “if this mass of mad contradiction really existed, quakerish and blood-thirsty, too gorgeous and too threadbare, austere, and yet pandering preposterously to the lust of the eyes, the enemy of women and their foolish refuge, a solemn pessimist and a silly optimist, if this evil existed, then there was in this evil something quite supreme and unique. . . . The only explanation which immediately came to my mind was that Christianity did not come from heaven, but from hell. Really, if Jesus of Nazareth was not Christ, He must have been Antichrist.”

It was at this moment that the “mere journalist” in search of truth found the key that fit the lock: he turned doubt against doubt.

“Perhaps,” he thought, “it is Christianity that is sane and all its critics that are mad—in various ways.”

* * *

With this entirely new premise in an age Victorian and man victorious, a poet like Swinburne was easily explained. “It was no longer a complication of diseases in Christianity, but a complication of diseases in Swinburne.”

“The restraints of Christians saddened him simply because he was more hedonist than a healthy man should be. The faith of Christians angered him because he was more pessimist than a healthy man should be. In the same way, the Malthusians by instinct attacked Christianity; not because there is anything especially anti-Malthusian about Christianity but because there is something a little anti-human about Malthusianism.”

Having come thus far in his unique journey, Chesterton then discovered “the centre of orthodox theology which has especially insisted that Christ was not a being apart from God and man, like an elf, nor yet a being half human and half not, like a centaur, but both things at once and both things thoroughly, very man and very God.”

God is not a compromise, Chesterton concluded, but two things “at the top of their energy; love and wrath both burning.” He illustrated his point with a biblical paradox that has often confounded Christians: “He that will lose his life, the same shall save it.”

It is a piece of everyday advice for sailors or mountaineers. It might be printed in an Alpine guide or a drill book. This paradox is the whole principle of courage; even of quite earthly or quite brutal courage. A man cut off by the sea may save his life if he will risk it on the precipice. He can only get away from death by continually stepping within an inch of it. A soldier surrounded by enemies, if he is to cut his way out, needs to combine a strong desire for living with a strange carelessness about dying. He must not merely cling to life, for then he will be a coward, and will not escape. He must not merely wait for death, for then he will be a suicide, and will not escape. He must seek his life in a spirit of furious indifference to it; he must desire life like water and yet drink death like wine.

Chesterton found that this duplex passion was the Christian key to ethics. Everywhere, he noted, the creed makes a moderation out of the still crash of two impetuous emotions: “One can hardly think too little of one’s self. One can hardly think too much of one’s soul.”

Charity, said G. K., is a paradox like courage and modesty (“the balance between mere pride and mere prostration”). “Stated baldly, charity certainly means one of two things—pardoning unpardonable acts, or loving unlovable people. . . . Christianity came in here as before. It came in startlingly with a sword and clove one thing from another. It divided the crime from the criminal. The criminal we must forgive unto seventy times seven. The crime we must not forgive at all.”

In our Tolstoyean tendencies, he said, we constantly insist that when the lamb lies down with the

lamb, the lion becomes lamb-like. "But that is brutal annexation and imperialism on the part of the lamb. That is simply the lamb absorbing the lion instead of the lion eating the lamb. The real problem is—Can the lion lie down with the lamb and still retain his royal ferocity? That is the problem the Church attempted; that is the miracle she achieved."

The answer, as Chesterton discovered it in his singular route as a journalist, is balance. "This was the big fact about Christian ethics," he concluded: "the discovery of the new balance."

Balance, said G. K., was not always in one man's body as in the case of Becket, who wore a hair shirt under his gold and crimson; "the balance was often distributed over the whole body of Christendom. . . . Because a man prayed and fasted on the Northern snows, flowers could be flung at his festival in the Southern cities, and because fanatics drank water on the sands of Syria, men could still drink cider in the orchards of England."

The perfect happiness of men on the earth (if it ever comes) will not be a flat and solid thing, like the satisfaction of animals. It will be an exact and perilous balance; like that of a desperate romance. Man must have just enough faith in himself to have adventures, and just enough doubt of himself to enjoy them. . . .

This is the thrilling romance of Orthodoxy. People have fallen into a foolish habit of speaking of orthodoxy as something heavy, humdrum, and safe. There never was anything so perilous or so exciting as orthodoxy. It was sanity; and to be sane is more dramatic than to be mad. It was the equilibrium of a man behind madly rushing horses, seeming to stoop this way and to sway that, yet in every attitude having the grace of statuary and the accuracy of arithmetic.

* * *

Chesterton was a happy writer who found everything an adventure. Once pitied by a well-meaning friend who found him confined with flu, he quickly advised her not to fret about his lack of subject material.

"Madam," he said, "I could write an essay on this chair." And so he might have, bestowing upon it the great grain of time and the spirit of the man who created it for the convenience of others. All was grist for his mill.

In one of his most perceptive essays, he simply emptied his pockets to find tram tickets that spoke proudly of "municipal patriotism," a pocketknife that revealed "all the swords of Feudal and all the weals of Industrial War," a piece of chalk that at once produced "all the art and all the frescoes of the world," a coin from which rose not only "the image and superscription of our own Caesar, but all gov-

ernment and order since the world began," a box of matches—"then I saw fire, which is stronger even than steel, the old, fierce female thing, the thing we all love, but dare not touch."

"But I have not space to say what were the items in the long and splendid procession of poetical symbols that came pouring out. I cannot tell you all the things that were in my pocket. I can tell you one thing, however, that I could not find in my pocket. I allude to my railway ticket."

Much of his humor is now aphorism and legend. Asked what one book he would want on a deserted island, he quickly replied, *Thomas's Guide to Practical Shipbuilding*. Later he amended his remarks to say that if the island happened to be one he particularly enjoyed, he would stay quite content with the *Pickwick Papers*. G. K. greatly admired Charles Dickens' humor and style, which he delineated in two volumes.

He often debated such skeptics as George Bernard Shaw on socialism; and the two, it is said, had more friendship in disagreement than most people have in agreement. He also toured America to debate such atheist evolutionists as Clarence Darrow. Once when the microphone failed, G. K. jumped up to laugh: "You see, science is not infallible."

Darrow wrote shortly after the encounter that if he and Chesterton "had lived where we could have become better acquainted, eventually we would have ceased to debate, I firmly believe."

It may very well be that the journalist who eventually wrote definitive books on the philosophies of St. Francis and St. Thomas Aquinas is not only a humorist but a religious humorist, the only one of his kind in this or any other age. He could never understand why religion had to be dismissed by fellow journalists as dull or controversial. Certainly it could not be both and he chose to think it was neither.

Chesterton suggested that God himself laughed. "There was in that shattering personality a thread that must be called shyness. There was something that He hid from all men when He went up to the mountain to pray. There was something He covered constantly by abrupt silence or impetuous isolation. There was some one thing that was too great for God to show us when He walked upon our earth; and I have sometimes fancied that it was His mirth."

Chesterton had joined the joyful people to find an immortality of his own:

*They rattle reason out through many a sieve
That stores the sand and lets the gold go free;
And all these things are less than dust to me
Because my name is Lazarus and I live.*

Abortion and the definition of a person

WILLIAM HASKER

Is the fetus a human being, or is it not? This is *the* question concerning abortion. Not the only question, of course—but the answers to all the others will be strongly affected by the answer to this one.

For Christians, this question has a very specific meaning. In Christian belief, each human person is, through God's power, capable of an endless life—a life to be spent either in the enjoyment of God's presence or in exclusion from it. In other words, each human being has—or is—a soul. So the question about the fetus is simply, does it possess a human soul or does it not?

In discussing this question I shall not produce any new medical, legal, or theological facts, though I shall recall some facts already well known to most persons interested in the question. I shall be primarily concerned to develop the implications and consequences of one way of interpreting these facts. If, as I believe, these consequences show that interpretation to be untenable, then the way will be open to propose another interpretation.

* * *

If one asks the question, "At what time does the fetus begin to have a soul?" it seems one is irresistibly pushed back to the very first moment of conception, to the union of sperm and ovum. Given the continuity of development of the fetus, the designation of any later moment seems arbitrary—an *ad hoc* move motivated only by the desire to escape certain difficulties. The moment of birth? But birth is *not* a "moment," but a process—so which stage of the process shall be selected? And is it not clear that the physical changes at birth, while significant, are minor in comparison to the total changes that occur both earlier and later? Quickening? But we know that the first perceptible movement of the fetus is by no means the beginning of its life—and who is to say how many imperceptible movements have preceded it? To select the moment of implantation in the uterus is, I would argue, equally arbitrary—and does not solve the problems anyway. Gardner points out that in a certain percentage of cases identical twins separate into distinct organisms only *after*

implantation (*Abortion: The Personal Dilemma*, p. 123).

These considerations seem to constitute a clear case for regarding every conceptus as a human being, and for some time I accepted this conclusion. What I wish to do now is to develop certain consequences of this view, consequences which eventually led me to abandon it. The consequences may be roughly classified as moral, legal, and theological, though I shall not pause to sort them out as I go.

First, let us consider what might, on this view, be acceptable grounds for abortion. I can think of only one: the abortion of the fetus might be justified if this is the only way to prevent the otherwise *certain* death of the mother. My wording is deliberately strong. To see why such strong wording is necessary, we may consider briefly some of the more plausible alternative grounds for abortion. Danger to the mother's life? Danger to her (physical or mental) health? Pregnancy the result of rape or incest? Severe abnormality of the fetus? In each case, we have only to ask whether we could morally condone the deliberate killing of a *living person* on such grounds—and if not, then neither can we condone the killing of an unborn person.

What about the legal consequences of abortion? On the interpretation just suggested, abortion is the deliberate, premeditated killing of an innocent human being—in other words, first degree murder. Thus the appropriate penalty for abortion would be exactly the same as that for murder—and note that guilt and penalty must apply not only to the abortionist himself (whether "back-street" or a licensed medical practitioner), but also to the woman who willingly lends her body to the procedure. Is it only for strategic reasons, I wonder, that anti-abortionists have not been heard to advocate this?

But even if all the abortionists could be put out of business, the problems for this view would not be done with unless certain methods of contraception could also be eliminated. The "monthly pill" (using progestandins) now under development works by inducing what is essentially a "normal" monthly period *whether or not* fertilization and implantation have taken place, thus killing the fetus if there is

one. This, to be sure, is not quite like ordinary abortion in that one is not deliberately killing a specific, known individual; it is more like firing a gun into a darkened room so as to kill anyone who may happen to be there. But what of the intra-uterine loop? While there is not definite medical knowledge concerning the way IUDs work, the probability is that they do not prevent fertilization itself but rather prevent the implantation of the fertilized ovum. But if the fertilized ovum is a human being, then to prevent its implantation is most certainly to kill it—and the medical and social agencies which provide IUDs for this purpose are guilty of homicide. Indeed, by distributing such devices the United States government has committed mass murder on a scale to make the Nazi atrocities pale by comparison!

But even if all such means of contraception were eliminated, a certain theological problem remains. Each human being, we say, has an eternal destiny; and each fertilized ovum, we are told, is a human being. What, then, is the eternal destiny of the estimated one-half of all such human beings which fail of implantation? Surely they cannot be damned, and, lacking a doctrine of limbo, there is no escaping the conclusion that heaven is full of these creatures! Is any further comment necessary?

* * *

If the reader has followed me this far, I trust he or she will understand that I find these consequences of the view that the fertilized ovum is a human being totally unacceptable and utterly incredible. Yet I would urge that each of these consequences is one to which the adherent of that view is strictly and unavoidably committed by the logic of his position. I acknowledge, and regret, the gross and repellent character of some of them, but where do the grossness and repellency come from, if not from the view itself we are discussing?

I will further gladly admit that very few, if any, of those who regard the conceptus as a human person actually affirm and accept these consequences of their view. That they do not speaks well for their humanity and for their common sense, but does it not also cast a little doubt on the firmness of their belief? It is a tenet common to Christianity and to contemporary philosophy that believing something includes (some would say, *is*) a disposition to act as if the belief were true, and that what a person believes can be learned as well or better from what he does than from what he says. When the anti-abortionist agrees that abortion may be justified if the fetus is badly deformed, or if the pregnancy is the result of incest, or if the mother's life is seri-

ously endangered, he may be demonstrating compassion and concern for the persons involved. But is he not also showing us that—in this one case, at least—he does *not* really regard the conceptus as an actual human being, but at most as a being which is potentially human? Indeed, the claim that the conceptus is a person almost seems to be (I do not say that it is) a tactical weapon of the anti-abortionist: it provides him with powerful support for a “hard-line” position against abortion in general, but it can be quietly ignored when necessary in dealing with those cases of abortion which he does approve, or in order to avoid the other consequences noted above. But surely this will not do. As Schopenhauer said, an argument is not like a taxicab, which you can take as far as you like, then pay off the driver and send it on its way.

If the view that every conceptus is a human being is untenable, what is the alternative? Can we determine some definite time subsequent to conception when human status is achieved? I think not. One could of course stipulate such a time, but would the stipulation have any basis other than the desire to avoid difficulties? I think we must simply confess that, assuming there is a definite time at which the fetus becomes a human person, we just do not know what that time is.

But can we find rest in our confession of ignorance? Isn't the decision one which has to be made? As the argument above has amply shown, many practical consequences hinge on whether or not in a specific case the fetus is regarded as a human being. Surely our admission of ignorance does not give us the right to walk away from these cases.

Indeed not. But what I wish to suggest is that the decision needs to be seen in a somewhat different light from that in which we have been viewing it up to this point. I suggest that the question of the human status of the fetus is not a matter for theoretical inquiry but an issue requiring a practical decision. The question is not, *When is the fetus a human person?*—for this is a question we are utterly unable to answer. The question is rather, at what point shall we human beings begin to *regard* and to *treat* the fetus as a human person?

On the one hand, it is clearly out of the question to place the time at which the human person is recognized later than the time of birth. To treat the newborn as a nonperson is surely morally repugnant to the vast majority in our society, and it could open the door to treating the retarded, the chronically ill, the senile, and the generally nonproductive members of society as nonpersons. For similar reasons, it is at least questionable to deny human status to the fetus in the very late stages of pregnancy. For

should we do this, we must still face the fact that such a fetus would be perfectly capable of surviving with normal care, were natural or Caesarean child-birth to occur immediately. To kill a fetus at this stage, I submit, is psychologically and therefore also morally indistinguishable from killing an infant.

On the other hand, it seems undesirable to treat the fetus in the very early stages of pregnancy as already a human person, for reasons that I have tried to make clear. As a reasonable compromise between the extremes, I suggest the following: *The fetus is to be regarded and treated as a human person when it reaches the stage of development at which it is capable of independent existence as a human organism, supported by the care which is normally given to newborn children.* Such "normal care" would include oxygen tents and the like, but not the "artificial womb" should one be developed.

The above principle, it must be emphasized, is put forward as a proposal for a practical policy, and is not based on any claim to "know" when the fetus becomes a person. Accordingly, I would welcome counter-proposals, provided that they are supported by relevant reasons and are not based on erroneous claims to know what I have said cannot be known. I cannot anticipate, at this point, what relevant reasons might be adduced for a policy different from the one I have proposed, so there is little point in discussing that question further.

But, it may be objected, surely *God* knows when the fetus becomes a person, even if we do not. Certainly. If there is a truth about this to be known, *God* knows it. But it is equally certain that in this case, as in so many others, *God* has not told us what he knows. On the other hand, is it even clear that there must *be* a truth to be known? Is it not possible that for *God*, also, the personhood of the fetus is a matter for decision? That when it perishes, if its development has reached such a point that there is something worth preserving for immortal life, then *God* preserves it, and if not, not? In Austin Farrer's words: "We do not know where to draw the line; that is to say, we do not know where *God* draws it. But we may be sure that he loves and saves whatever is there to be saved or loved; if his love or power does not act, it is because there is nothing for it to

act upon" (*Love Almighty and Ills Unlimited*, p. 190).

Suppose that the policy set forth above is accepted. What further practical consequences follow? It follows, of course, that in certain circumstances abortion may be contemplated as a morally acceptable course of action. It does not follow that one must be an enthusiastic advocate of abortion. The fetus, after all, is a being which could, in time, become a human person, capable of seeing in the light of the sun and of knowing *God* in the light of his Son. The fetus is not that person as yet, but also it is not nothing; it has a value and a dignity of its own, just as each of *God's* creatures—a bird, a flower, a blade of grass—has its own value and dignity. It is not yet, we surmise, the image of *God*, but it is the carefully primed and prepared canvas on which that image might be painted.

For such reasons as these, among others, it seems repugnant to rely upon abortion as a primary method of birth control, however necessary it may be in some cases as a method of last resort. Nor need one suppose that abortion will provide a permanent, satisfactory remedy for the ills it is supposed to alleviate, any more than antibiotics have provided a final solution to the problem of venereal disease. When problems whose causes are in part moral and spiritual are treated symptomatically through mechanical and physiological means, the evil tends to reappear in another form, sometimes even stronger because of the alleviation of the immediate symptoms. Still, in the present imperfect state of the world penicillin has its work to do, and so, sometimes, does abortion. For the most part we can only imitate *God* and help human beings one at a time. The proposal here presented can enable us to treat the problems of abortion on an individual basis, with true concern for the mother, the father, and their living children, as well as for the child who will live if no abortion is performed. And it will allow us to make decisions of compassion which meet the ineluctable needs of already-living persons without carrying in our hearts the guilt of murder. This gain may be small in comparison with the awesome total of human need and suffering. It is still, I submit, a gain worth making.

Journal Review

THE GULAG ARCHIPELAGO

By Aleksandr I. Solzhenitsyn. Translated from the Russian by Thomas P. Whitney. New York: Harper & Row, 1974. Cloth, \$12.50; Paper, \$1.95.

One is inclined to speak of Solzhenitsyn in superlatives, not only because of his literary eminence but also because of the epic scope of his subject matter. Long as it is, this book constitutes only the first third of a whole, of which two parts have now appeared in Russian. It covers the period in Russian history from 1918 to 1956, embracing the catastrophic years following the Revolution as well as the author's personal experiences. It contains an annotated glossary of almost 400 names and terms.

The book is at once a chronicle, a history, a philosophy, and a confession. The word "Gulag" in the title is an acronym for the Soviet penal system under Stalin, a network of "islands," a psychological empire within the Soviet Union. The ships are the windowless boxcars that transport dirty, hopeless men from port to port. Statistics vary, but the inhabitants of this "empire" may have numbered up to thirty million.

Solzhenitsyn considers the book dynamite. He dedicates it not only to those who have already perished but also to those who, either still within or outside of prison, may in the future suffer because of its revelations. One death has already resulted—that of the friend entrusted with part of the manuscript. In 1973, after five days of interrogation, she revealed its hiding place and then committed suicide.

As a confession *Gulag* is a remarkable revelation of growth in self-awareness. Born in the year of the Revolution (1917), Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn grew up in the euphoric atmosphere of a nation reborn. As a young Soviet officer he was devoted to Marxism, a martinet proud of the power to issue commands and to expect servile obedience. But his downfall

came because in a letter to a friend he casually wrote a lighthearted slur against Stalin. He was arrested even though at the time he was serving at the front in the war with Germany. Only then did he gradually come to apprehend the unfairness, the repression, the errors in the Soviet system.

In the beginning chapters he dwells at length on the psychology of arrest. It was done with planned arbitrariness. Terror of arrest was an approved weapon in the new social order according to both Lenin and Trotsky. Quotas had to be filled and many innocent were snared. After an evening of dancing and theater, for instance, a girl might be escorted by her date to the Lubyanka Prison. In 1937, a woman came to a reception room of the police (NKVD) and asked what to do for an unfed, unweaned infant of a neighbor who had been arrested. She sat for two hours waiting for their reply, whereupon their response was to toss *her* into a cell. Some were tricked into capture; others were unobtrusively seized in crowded stations; many were ordered out of bed during the night. Solzhenitsyn wonders at the submissiveness of the Russian people, and at his own as well. Why did we not cry out, he asks. Why didn't I?

Much of the tone of the work is ironic. He uses the metaphor of "sewage" to illustrate how the Soviets disposed of undesirables, traitors, and subversives. Sometimes his irony works through metaphor, sometimes overtly in contemptuous exclamations, and often in parenthetical additions or interpretations. Stalin's "sewage" consisted of peasants and kulaks, of skilled engineers and craftsmen, of the intelligentsia (professors, priests, authors). In the 1920s all university students were arrested, as well as all

persons who had ever lived abroad, and all who had emigrated to Russia—Poles, Finns, Chinese. Hardest of all to believe: war heroes, captured by the enemy and returned to the motherland, or those who had managed to escape! All these groups were the waves flushed into the sewers of the Archipelago under the euphemism of "social prophylaxis"!

Solzhenitsyn shows that terror and suppression were already part of Lenin's political philosophy before the 1917 Revolution. All "insects, malingerers, parasites, saboteurs" were to be shot, wrote Lenin. The enormity of prison-camp torture as recounted by Solzhenitsyn is difficult to apprehend. The tales of torture experienced by returning Vietnam prisoners is still fresh in the minds of Americans. Severe torture, as Solzhenitsyn experienced and observed it, comprised every conceivable battering and breaking of the human frame; and even the "mild" torture, described at considerable length, is horrible to read.

Waves of arrests continued, becoming especially heavy in 1937 and 1938. The rationale for this was incomprehensible—even at times bitterly amusing. A District Party conference ended with the audience rising in applause for Stalin. After three, four, five minutes they tired, but no one dared to stop applauding, for NKVD officers were watching. Finally, a paper factory director decided sensibly that eleven minutes was enough and he sat down. That same night he was arrested. A peasant with six children to feed worked hard at the collective farm and earned a medal. He stood up to receive the applause of the assembly, but in his acceptance speech he unfortunately said he could better use a sack of flour than the medal. The newly decorated hero and his six dependents were forthwith arrested. In 1947, even children were arrested for stealing a cucumber or a few potatoes from a field. One child got ten years for stealing a spool of thread.

By 1950, the standard sentence was twenty-five years!

Solzhenitsyn marvels at his nation's barbarity. What was already regarded as barbarous under Peter the Great and impossible under Catherine was being practiced by human beasts over defenseless victims in the twentieth century. "And so the waves rolled," he writes. "Over them all billowed and gushed the multimillion waves of the dispossessed kulaks." The number was so immeasurably large that the prisons could no longer hold them. "In sheer size this tidal wave swelled beyond the bounds of anything the penal system of even an immense state can permit itself. There was nothing to be compared with it in all Russian history." It was an "ethnic catastrophe." In 1934, one quarter of Leningrad was purged. In so doing, Russia robbed herself of her best workers. Mismanagement, low production, famine ensued.

The author's bitterest venom is spewed out on the Soviet judicial system under Stalin. Nothing was supported by evidence. The questions asked were: What is the accused's class? What is his education and upbringing? What is his origin? The mild methods of wringing a confession from the accused included sleeplessness, night interrogations, intimidation, sound and light effects, tickling, burning, sitting on a chair for six days with one's legs dangling, thirst, starvation, beating, lying in filth. The worst tortures are too horrible and degrading to print.

In the face of this torture, the few examples of courage he witnessed are thrilling to read. One such was the philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev, who firmly set forth his religious and moral principles and who eventually was liberated and exiled. Another was an old woman who shouted defiance at her judges: "There is nothing you can do to me. You are afraid of each other and those above you. I am not. I would be glad to be judged by God this minute."

The author ponders the sheer endurance of some prisoners and the agony of their suffering. "Throughout the grinding of our souls in the gears of the Nighttime Institution [night interrogations] our souls are pulverized and our flesh hangs

down in tatters like a beggar's rags." The interrogators, he says, are not men of broad culture; they cannot think logically; they are "stripped bare of universal, human ideals." They were venal, eager for gain, and night interrogations paid more. By implication, Solzhenitsyn puts the regime of the tsars in a better light.

Who is to blame for all this injustice? Certainly the pathological suspicions of Comrade Stalin. Compare the author's unforgettable portrait of the man in *The First Circle*, sequestered in the innermost rooms of the Kremlin. But Solzhenitsyn also blames ideology. Ideology, he says—that belief in a cause which justifies evil-doing—has been the bane of the twentieth century and of our motherland. Russia is even worse than Germany in his opinion, for Germany has at least punished its evildoers but Russia has not. We did not cry out when we should have. Our history books cover up the facts. The scarred and sealed-over conscience of our people must be opened up.

Many chapters are devoted to the evolution of the judicial process since 1917, and ironically the progress seems downward. In the early 1920s, the Troikas (secret panel of judges with absolute power) could sentence a "socially dangerous person" without a trial; many innocent persons were arrested and sentenced to work on huge projects like the White Sea Canal and the Moscow-Volga Canal; sentences were predetermined, typed out beforehand, with the names of prisoners added later. In the 1940s, court sessions lasted one minute. Soft, white, uncaloused hands were enough to warrant a sentence. Trials were chaotic. One judge could be openly insulted in court by another. No stenographic records were kept. Bribery was common. Ostensibly, a prisoner in a cell had a right to petition, but he was given a paper 3 x 4 inches, watery ink and a broken pen. The letters ran and faded out. In the church trials, only prosecution witnesses were allowed to testify. The old Tsarist code had been thrown out, but a new one was not composed. Solzhenitsyn's conclusion: "The whole thing makes one want to vomit."

But not everything in prison life was bad. His first cell, after solitary confine-

ment, was his first love. "Here for the first time you saw people who were not your enemies." He found delight and mental stimulation from his cellmates. Readers familiar with *The First Circle* will recall the famous Christmas celebration and the mock trial of Igor. Here languages were learned, lectures given, scientific treatises composed, mini-celebrations held, packages shared, poems read. Tiny joys were magnified, such as seeing the sun directly for the first time. But not all prisoners enjoyed this camaraderie. Because of his knowledge of physics and mathematics, Solzhenitsyn was eventually moved to a special prison called a *sharaska*, a place for qualified prisoners to work on technical projects for Stalin.

In the author's merciless self-analysis he has found prison a place to correct his own mistakes. How slow I was, he says, to learn the truth. He realizes his debt to a pious grandmother whom he remembers kneeling before her ikon. He regrets forgetting spiritual subtleties inculcated since childhood. He acknowledges the debt to his ancestors for what little moral passion he did possess when at age twenty he refused to enter the NKVD schools with their bait of special rations and triple pay. He yearns for the days of his forefathers when morality was not relative and distinctions between good and evil were simply perceived by the heart.

He deplores the Marxist suppression of religion. Indignantly he exclaims, "A person convinced that he possessed spiritual truth was required to conceal it from his own children!" Indignantly he saw prostitutes being given lighter sentences than priests.

A strong moral passion pervades the book—a passion for truth, for the old values of the right to freedom, to human dignity, to religious belief and practice, to judicial process.

Russians may never be able to read this work, but it is a book profitable for all men living today. It has made me glad to be an American, where there is still, despite the shame of Watergate and social inequity, a public moral indignation and deep soul-searching.

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, in my opinion, stands as the greatest living author

today. His capacity for history, for remembering and assembling mountains of facts, his colloquial style blended with prose of classic beauty, his lack of narrow parochialism, his knowledge of world culture as well as of his own great past, his wit, his moral earnestness—all give him his

eminence. The book could be faulted on its occasional repetitiveness, but I think that this stricture can be forgiven when one recalls the fragmented and difficult circumstances of its composition.

Winifred Holkeboer

BRIGHT SHADOW OF REALITY: C. S. LEWIS AND THE FEELING INTELLECT

By Corbin Scott Carnell. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. 180 pages, \$2.95 (paper).

In *Bright Shadow of Reality* Professor Carnell discusses a motif (I shall call it transcendental longing) which C. S. Lewis shared with many other writers. Carnell provides an impressive array of authors who have expressed this motif. Eugene O'Neill, for example, has a character describe himself as being "in quest of the secret which is hidden over there, beyond the horizon"; Thomas Wolfe calls this secret "the doorless land of faery, that illimitable haunted country that opened somewhere below a leaf or a stone"; Goethe called it "blissful longing"; Koestler describes it as "anti-materialistic nostalgia"; William Morris spoke of it as "ravishing sweetness" and the "heart-breaking melancholy of our experience"; Tolkien speaks of the "piercing glimpse of joy, and heart's desire."

This quality of *Sehnsucht*, this numinous, romantic longing, this ecstatic wonder has been called by still others "causeless melancholy" and a "*mysterium tremendum*." What these all have in common, as Mr. Carnell defines it, is a "sense of separation from what is desired, that longing which always points beyond." It may be well to cite at length one of Lewis's own statements about this phenomenon:

"In speaking of this desire for our own far-off country, which we find in ourselves even now, I feel a certain shyness. I am almost committing an indecency. I am trying to rip open the inconsolable secret in each one of you—the secret which hurts so much that you take revenge on it by calling it names like Nostalgia and Romanticism and Adolescence; the secret also which pierces with such sweetness

that when, in very intimate conversation, the mention of it becomes imminent, we grow awkward and affect to laugh at ourselves; the secret we hide and cannot tell, though we desire to do both. We cannot tell it because it is a desire for something that has never actually appeared in our experiences. We cannot hide it because our experience is constantly suggesting it, and we betray ourselves like lovers at the mention of a name..." (from *The Weight of Glory*).

Carnell has exhibited in a very convincing way that the search for this real but elusive quality is the continuing motif in all of C. S. Lewis's work. Lewis encountered it already in his childhood reading: "As long as I live my imagination of Paradise will retain something of my brother's toy garden." He saw it in Wagnerian opera, in Norse mythology, in George MacDonald's stories. He found it in Wordsworth, whose phrase "surprised by joy" furnished him the title for his autobiography. His favorite authors were the ones who acknowledged this reality—"an interest," as Mr. Carnell puts it, "in that dimension of experience which gives rise to nostalgia and longing." He wrote about this Joy-Melancholy tension in all of his work, setting it forth especially in four types of image: distant hills, exotic gardens, islands, and certain kinds of music. But he used not only these specific images; more significant than these is his predilection for the fairy tale, which is in a class by itself as an evoker of this longing.

Carnell takes some pains, however, to head off any notion that Lewis was a nineteenth-century romanticist. He was,

in fact, something of an eclectic. He was a logician par excellence, and had a great deal of confidence, for example, in the validity of the ontological argument. He also said, "I am a rationalist." But he went on to add in the same paragraph: "For me reason is the natural organ of truth; but imagination is the organ of meaning. Imagination, producing new metaphors or revivifying old, is not the cause of truth, but its condition." All his life he retained his faith in romantic literature. But, again, it is an archetypal romanticism to which he subscribes. Lewis would have nothing to do with that view which limits art and thought to mere sensation, or that attitude which divorces art from moral considerations. In this he is with the "counter-romantics." Still, he retained his affinities for romantic literature because he thought this literature to be compatible with Christian metaphysics.

Carnell's procedure in this book is to trace the theme of *Sehnsucht* within the rich fabric of C. S. Lewis's own life. In fact, the book can be read as biography, supplementing such works as Clyde Kilby's *The Christian World of C. S. Lewis*, Douglas Gilbert and Kilby's *C. S. Lewis: Images of His World*, Lewis's own autobiography, *Surprised By Joy*, and essays and chapters about Lewis's life scattered in various books by various authors. Carnell's approach is reminiscent of that of Samuel Johnson in his *Lives of the Poets*. Carnell, too, intersperses his references to his subject's works with thoughtful and interpretative comments. (His analysis of *Till We Have Faces* is unusually well done.) He also treats with some thoroughness the whole subject of influences—the many and diverse people who left their imprint upon Lewis's mind and art. Lewis emerges more than ever as a whole man, a complete person, a thinker who distrusted any ideology which insists on exclusiveness. It may seem initially strange, for example, that Lewis was attracted to both Aristotle and Plato. But this puzzle disappears when one perceives how for Lewis any single system of whatever kind leaves too much data unassimilated and needs other—even contradictory—data to supplement and amplify it.

Carnell has done us all a service by demonstrating so convincingly that this sense of incompleteness about anything transient, this longing for the infinite, this holy restlessness, is what gives scope and depth to C. S. Lewis's life and work. He does one thing more, and here he distinguishes Lewis from the other writers mentioned who record the experience of

Sehnsucht. He sets forth how it was this urge that ultimately drove Lewis to the Christian faith. Lewis himself recorded this disposition in his statement: "If I find in myself a desire which no experience in this world can satisfy, the most probable explanation is that I was made for another world."

Steve J. Van Der Weele

the prose and screen version of *Daisy Miller* are not pronounced. In fact, they seem to have a salutary effect—the movie enlivening and coloring the story, which in turn adds complexity and depth to the movie. Such a positive outcome is rare in the history of making books from movies, and should be applauded.

Edna Otte

DAISY MILLER

Directed by Peter Bogdanovich; starring Cybill Shepherd, Cloris Leachman, Eileen Brennan, Mildred Natwick, Barry Brown. MPAA rating: G.

Though filled with strong-willed characters and emotionally complex situations, the novels and stories of Henry James are not what one would call passionate or intense. The passions and actions of James' characters are strictured by their social milieu, and hemmed in by the hesitations and reservations of James' narrative style. Emotions are often so overlaid and oblique that the reader wonders precisely what is happening.

Fortunately, when his characters are removed from the thicket of James' prose and put into the hands of accomplished actors, as they are in the film adaptation of *Daisy Miller*, a great deal becomes clear. We now respond to the characters directly; intensities and eccentricities that once almost passed us by now stare us in the face. Daisy Miller's mother, for example, is rather inconsequential in the story; but as played by Cloris Leachman in the Bogdanovich movie, she is a weak, pitiful, irritating—and sometimes comic—human being, who retains an odd dignity and appeal.

Daisy Miller, of course, is not one of James' more tangled or complicated narratives. It is a relatively simple and direct novella that Bogdanovich has adapted to the screen without real wrenching. Two interesting changes in emphasis do occur, however.

The first is that minor characters, who accomplish little more than representing points of view in the story, become full-fledged and interesting people in the film. Bogdanovich has selected his cast well, and much of the credit must go to the three accomplished actresses who play

the secondary female roles. Their performances seem exactly right. Each manages to add a dimension of fullness to James' character without affecting the story's focus.

Unfortunately, Cybill Shepherd does not manage the same feat in the central role of Daisy Miller. There is a strident quality to her performance that cannot be attributed to the move from James' quiet prose to technicolor screen. Daisy Miller—silly, chattering, flirtatious, and brash as she is—should nonetheless have an empty-headed warmth and vulnerability about her; in Ms. Shepherd's hands Daisy acquires instead a high-pitched, slightly hysterical quality that I often found irritating.

The male roles in this film, although not as well played as that of Mrs. Miller, are all adequately done. Barry Brown in particular is very good as the nice but "stiff" (Daisy's word) young American who has been "too long in Europe."

A second change of emphasis that occurs in the process of adaptation is in the focus of the narrative. James deals with sensibilities and approaches to life; Bogdanovich with young lovers. James shows us Old World wisdom and cynicism in uneasy contact with the energetic and often foolish innocence of the new; he makes us conscious of the difficulty of transcending social mores. Bogdanovich gives us the young man who cannot step through accepted social morality to reach the girl, who insists on being her foolish self; his is a low-keyed love story, its tone not of tragedy, but of regret.

The differences in emphasis between

Short Notices

JAMES DAANE

A Psychology of Nothingness, by William F. Kraft. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974, 160 pp., \$5.95.

An excellent literary description of the nothingness with which loneliness, anxiety, apathy, depression, boredom are filled. The author, who teaches psychology at Carlow College, Pittsburgh, and is a practicing psychotherapist, contends that nothingness is a positive dynamic that moves us to a more mature and fuller life.

This seems to me to be pretty bad psychology and patently horrible theology. Kraft tries to bring something out of nothing—something only God can do—and for all his very apt descriptions of the experiences of nothingness in human life, he succeeds only in making nothingness larger and more poignant. The apparent success of his venture lies in his insinuation of something positively good into a nothingness that can only bear negative predications. At bottom his view is a Promethean posturing against the real threat of nothingness.

Nothingness is a form of death, and only the resurrection can bring out of it a richer and more meaningful life. But read the book for its apt description of the psychological forms of nothingness in human life.

Life As Eucharist, by Norman Pittenger. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973, 104 pp., \$1.95.

Here is a rich, provocative discussion (especially for non-Episcopalians) of the

nature and meaning of the Lord's Supper regarded as a liturgical act of the church. Pittenger is an Anglican, and his explanation of the Eucharist will be helpful to Christians in whose traditions sacraments seem to have little relationship to the church and to preaching. For Pittenger the Eucharist is the showing forth (Reformed people say "proclaiming") of the Lord's death till he comes, and the Christian life is also such a showing forth.

Dwight L. Moody: American Evangelist, 1837-1899, by J. F. Findlay, Jr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973, 440 pp., \$4.95.

A very excellent biography of the great evangelist which sees Moody and his message in his own times. First published in 1969 by the University of Chicago.

Many Witnesses, One Lord, by William Barclay. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973, 128 pp., \$1.50.

A competent scholar shows the rich diversity of the New Testament and faces the question of how to preach the New Testament so that sermons will be more than Christian pep talks.

The God Who Makes a Difference; A Christian Appeal to Reason, by Bernard L. Ramm. Waco, Texas: Word, 1972, 160 pp., \$5.95.

Ramm presents his apologetics in his usual clear and perceptive manner. He covers much of the waterfront and the reader of this book must be willing to study it.

God's Way of Reconciliation, by D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1972, 380 pp., \$7.95.

A long commentary on the second chapter of Ephesians, Paul's great letter about the church. An excellent treatment of a powerful chapter.

Christian Science, Seventh-Day Adventism, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormonism, by Anthony A. Hoekema. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.

Brief histories and theological assessments by a long-time painstaking scholar

of these matters. Excerpted and updated from the author's study *The Four Major Cults*.

The Church in Search of Its Self, by Robert S. Paul. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972, 384 pp., \$7.95.

A serious study of the nature of the church and a history of the varied shapes it has assumed in the past. Worth study, for, as the title suggests, the church is not sure about what it really is.

A Matter of Eternity, Selections from the Writings of Dorothy L. Sayers, chosen and introduced by Rosamond Kent Sprague. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973, 139 pp., \$4.50.

Dorothy L. Sayers was one of those rare souls who perceived the fascinating character of Christian doctrines and let it sparkle in her writings. Her writings blend theology and devotion in an exhilarating recipe.

Letters to the Journal

Editors:

W. Fred Graham's "The Death of Transcendence" (*RJ*, April) does a neat job of pinning down and analyzing secular modern man's options for explaining God's world from an essentially godless point of view. I found his comments in each of the first five sections pithy and quotable.

However, in his actual dealing with the transcendent dimension, I was troubled by his wrestlings with "remetaphorizing" in hope that theology might grab hold of our contemporary neighbor's imagination. There is certainly a tension which we all experience when we seek to communicate the good news to secularized people, and this often calls for sanctified imagination in search for just the right figure to illustrate the point. But I think we must do full justice to the grand scope of biblical themes and models before we rush on to more modern models, myths, or analogies.

To illustrate, recently I lectured on the biblical theme of God's covenant relationship to his people. The theme was traced through both Testaments, with strong

Search for Understanding, by Warren A. Quanbeck. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972, 125 pp., \$2.95.

An effort at ecumenical dialogue which presents the distinctive features of Roman Catholicism, Lutheranism, and Calvinism, and then discusses the differences. Reading this remarkably compact and clear book by a Lutheran theologian is a theological education even for those without ecumenical interest.

The Story of Religion in America, by William W. Sweet. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973, 492 pp., \$4.95.

A classic history of religion in America. First printed in 1930, but do not let that put you off.

New Testament Words, by William Barclay. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974, 301 pp., \$3.95.

No dry Greek dictionary, this is a brilliant, concise, and very useful discussion of almost seventy key words of the Greek New Testament.

stress laid on the divine initiative out of pure grace, God's determination to maintain his commitment and to fulfill his purpose in covenanting a people into being, and the call to grateful obedience as our response to God's tenacious love, which acts in covenant goodness. In conversations after the lecture, a man told me he didn't think people today could relate to the legal concepts that are incorporated into the theme of covenant—treaty, sanction, liability, etc. When I asked what might communicate more clearly, he thought of love, fatherhood, and mercy. I pointed out that those were all ingredients of the biblical theme we had just been thinking through together, and to limit the idea of covenant to merely legal considerations was no more biblical than to eliminate the legal motif. . . .

The point is that modern man strives with a sense of guilt, even though his view of the world gives him no reason to have any guilt. The Bible tells him the reason. Modern man wants freedom; God comes as Liberator. Modern man sees no reason for existence; we read of a personal Creator. Love is an unknown quantity in to-

day's world; justifying, adopting, abiding love has worked in our behalf through Jesus Christ. The old-fashioned themes of the Scripture speak in such a trenchant way to our most basic needs and desires, today as always. I don't think we need to scramble for new myths or metaphors so much as we must return again and again to men's basic need of reunion with the God who made and loves us. . . .

Jack Buckley

Berkeley, Calif.

Editors:

The juxtaposition of the symposium on pornography and George Monsma's article on tax reform (*RJ*, March) raises an interesting issue. Much of the pornography panel's time was spent discussing a vital issue: the distinction between what Christians feel is wrong or improper to engage in, and that which the state should prohibit. It was succinctly put as an attempt to distinguish between that which is a sin and that which is a crime, with several members of the panel arguing that not all sins should be crimes.

Monsma's article does not seem to deal with this same issue in the area of income distribution, which I find disappointing (I have not read his earlier *RJ* article, where perhaps he did deal with this more explicitly). He makes what I consider a very correct point, that the Bible is very clear about the need for Christians to have a strong concern for distribution of income, and that the "haves" have a definite responsibility to the "have-nots," however those terms are defined. However, he does not defend his transition from that point to the one that we as Christians should try to use the coercive power of the state to impose our standards of what is an equitable distribution of income upon those members of society who disagree with us.

I believe that we as Christians are called to a very different view of both pornography and poverty than that which most of America holds. However, it is not clear we should attempt to use the force of law to make adherence to those views universal. This is not an argument for zero taxes, nor is it a defense of the regressive nature of many taxes which Monsma points out. However, it does raise the question of the appropriateness of a progressive tax. Despite the fact that we as a Christian community may deeply

believe in the appropriateness of progressivity in giving, do we have a right to ask for any more than a proportional enforced giving (taxation) from society? I believe the role of the state in income distribution would benefit from the same careful consideration as was exhibited in the symposium about the role of the state in pornography.

P. J. Hill

Powderville, Montana

Editors:

For oilmen, the people at Lone Star Producing Co. were unusually somber. The company had just drilled 31,441 feet into Oklahoma's Anadarko Basin looking for gas. Instead, the bit tapped into liquid sulfur under tremendous pressure, and hydrogen sulfide began eating away at the expensive high-tensile-steel drill string. For nearly three days, the crew fought back, often wearing gas masks to protect themselves from the lethal gas. Then, suddenly, the steel just fell apart at 15,000 feet, and the crew couldn't control the great pressures below. They quickly plugged the hole at 14,000 feet, dashing all hopes of superdeep production and forcing Lone Star to face the bitter truth that record-breaking Bertha Rogers No. 1 was a \$6-million flop.

That near-disaster last April highlights the hazards of drilling. (Bertha Rogers swallowed enough steel to erect a 14-story building.) Last year producers completed 74 wells below 20,000 feet; so far this year, more than thirty have been drilled.

With an average cost of \$2-million, these deep wells are a glaring example of the big investments to find more oil and gas. This is what the politicians and the people need to know—the extreme risks in this industry. Most wells are dry. Sometimes even the successful holes have not paid off because the price of gas was too low.

Lone Star spudded Bertha Rogers in November 1972, about eighty miles west of Oklahoma City, just 19 miles from the previous record-setting hole, a 30,050-foot well named Baden No. 1 that had cost Lone Star \$5.5-million—and was dry. But the company approached Bertha Rogers hopefully; and until the very end things looked good.

Then disaster hit. At first the company became tight-lipped. But the silence actu-

ally reflected concern over the safety of the crew. When the hole was finally plugged, Lone Star announced its costly record, and Lone Star's minor partners—Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America, Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co., and Aklahoma Natural Gas Co.—will have to look elsewhere for gas.

It is regrettable that no one in the oil industry has ever heard of academician George Monsma of Calvin College (*RJ*, March), when with his expertise only producers would be drilled with unconscionable profits. To participate in such profits, all one has to do is buy stock in the company. After Uncle Sam has taken his customary fifty per cent there still should be something left to benefit the stockholders.

S. J. Jansma, Sr.

Grand Rapids

Editors:

It is with some thankfulness, some amusement, and some sadness that Christians who have been working for social justice for many years view the publicity being given to the Declaration of Social Concern drawn up by the fifty evangelicals in their 1973 conference (*RJ*, Jan., May-June).

It is indeed strange and tragic that almost two thousand years after the Good News was brought to the world, the evangelicals now realize what it is all about. In a day when it is popular to love Jesus, maybe their task will be lighter than that of their forerunners. May God bless them in their endeavors, and may he grant them the acuteness of mind and conscience to recognize injustice when they see it and the courage to do something about it.

Winifred Brouwer

Grand Rapids

Editors:

A good Christian commentary journal is hard to find these days. I appreciate your emphasis on the ethical side of our relationships and look for and enjoy your movie reviews. Please do more of them.

Jim Visser

Edmonton

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION

by Chuck Gieser '61, Congress Participant
Associate Minister of Education
Christ Church of Oak Brook, Ill.

The process of evangelizing the world by the end of this century continues on in rejuvenated spirits. Participants in the International Congress on World Evangelization are back home in 150 nations with information, inspiration and determination they got while in Lausanne, Switzerland, for the Congress. They are already sharing their experiences and having a significant impact on their churches, organizations, and communities.

Altogether, about 4,000 people attended the ten-day event in July, including 2,425 participants. The others were observers, guests, news media personnel, staff and stewards. The participants, carefully selected to represent a cross section of evangelical leadership, included laity as well as clergy, women as well as men, young people as well as their elders, and those involved in a wide spectrum of specialized ministries.

Those who were invited came as individuals and not as official representatives of any churches or para-church groups. But among them were members—and leaders—of every major denomination. Many also came from the growing indigenous communities in developing countries. All were influential Christians with an evangelical commitment. Scores were Wheaton alumni.

Wheaton was represented at the Congress at every level of planning and participation. In the opening statement Bishop Jack Dain, Executive Chairman of

the Congress, said that the Congress would not have come into existence without the work and vision of Dr. Billy Graham '43, LittD '56. Dr. Don Hoke '41, MA'44, DD'59, was Director of the Congress. Dr. Leighton Ford '52 and Dr. Paul Little MA'58 were responsible for the selection and direction of the speakers. John Dettoni '59, MA'69 wrote the study guides for the pre-Congress papers and, together with Dr. Ted Ward '51, developed and implemented the concept of the study materials which will follow the Congress. Arthur Dominy '42 handled the complex hospitality arrangements; Steve Hoke '71, MA'72 was official photographer; Faith Sand Pidcoke '61 reported for the news media; and the list goes on. Over 100 participants in the Congress were Wheatonites.

Yet, not even the large number of participants would include Wheaton students who served as stewards, providing every imaginable service to those present.

Wheaton participation in the Congress was evident in the significant Lausanne Covenant which was developed during the Congress. Dr. Armerding was active in the preparation of this document, and the covenant itself reflects the basic convictions of Wheaton College since its inception.

Wheaton contributed much to the Congress—but Wheaton can learn much from the Congress as well.

WE CAN BE REMINDED . . .

. . . That content is fundamental to Chris-

tianity, and fundamental to Christian content is the authority of the Bible. Dr. Francis Schaeffer noted, "A holding to a strong view of Scripture or not holding to it is the watershed of the evangelical world." Wheaton has stressed the absolute authority of God's Word, and God has honored this stance.

. . . That power for the Christian is not ultimately in his knowledge, planning, or presentation but from God through the Holy Spirit. Rene Padilla '57, MA'60, in a moving address, reminded all that the church is growing as men pray—that the answer for evangelism is not more western technology, but more prayer. This was true in the early church, and it is true now in the church in Brazil, which is growing three times faster than the population of the country.

. . . Of the urgency to share Christ by all available means. Dr. Harold Lindsell '38, in his address entitled *The Suicide of Man*, noted that when you look at the world from the perspective "of the world itself, you will quickly discover that the world is in the process of committing suicide." But his conclusion was not pessimistic. "God's Kingdom is emerging in the midst of man's suicidal quest. God has a people, and He is calling out this people for His name from among all the nations of the earth. His body, the church, is being completed."

. . . That, as a church, we are to be different from the society around us. Samuel Escobar reminded us that Jesus created a

LAUSANNE 74

WHEATON FELLOWSHIP PRAYER BREAKFAST

The Wheaton Fellowship Prayer Breakfast at Lausanne 74 attracted over 160 enthusiastic alumni and friends to reminisce, share with each other and thank the Lord for the experience they were having. The focus, in keeping with the theme of the International Congress, was on what God has done and is doing through Wheaton alumni around the world in evangelism and missions. Each continent was represented by one of the key alumni attending the Congress from that area. Steve Hoke '71, MA'72 made the arrangements for the breakfast.

In addition to the men pictured on these pages, many of the conference leaders, being Wheaton graduates, were present

and gave greetings to the group. The participation and attendance of a number of students at the Congress and breakfast provided another indication of Wheaton's continued interest and significant participation in world evangelization.

In the closing moments of the fellowship time President Hudson T. Armerding '41 summarized, "*It is a privilege for Wheaton College to be in the place of service and ministry to so many Christians in leadership of international Christian missions work today.*" He spoke of the dual responsibility and opportunity for Wheaton in training Christian leadership for missionary work.

- Dr. Hudson T. Armerding was elected president of the World Evangelical Fellowship (WEF) at its Sixth General Assembly in Chateau D'Oex, Switzerland. Dr. Armerding had served as vice-president of WEF since 1972. The Fellowship, founded in 1951, is a service organization designed to develop greater understanding and closer cooperation among evangelical organizations around the world. Dr. Armerding was one of five persons selected to draft the Lausanne Covenant at the International Congress on World Evangelization in Switzerland in July.
- Dr. Arthur F. Holmes, Chairman of the department of philosophy, is the author of an article in the 15th edition of *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Dr. Holmes' eight-page contribution discusses the 20th Century debate, meaning, distinctive themes, historical developments and problems confronting Christian philosophy. Dr. Holmes concludes that "As a set of biblical ideas with far-reaching implications for a philosophically developed world view, Christian philosophy is an enduring reality. As a historical tradition adjusting to philosophical changes and contributing to philosophical inquiry, it has proved to be a persistent and creative force in the West."
- Dr. James Lower, associate professor of education, has been named to succeed Dr. Earle E. Cairns, professor of history, as chairman of the social science division. The chairmanship is on a rotating basis.
- Dr. Richard J. Stellway, assistant professor of sociology, has been named acting chairman of the department of sociology and anthropology. He replaces Dr. Marvin Mayers, who resigned to join Wycliffe Bible Translators at their Dallas Headquarters.
- Douglas Gilbert, assistant professor of art, is the subject of an article in the September issue of *Modern Photography*. The article said that "In a field full of individualists, Gilbert stands out as one who at a very young age realized he had to march to the sound of a drum that only he heard. It is from such photographers that we look for the rare and unusual accomplishment." The article traces Gilbert's photography career from his first Dick Tracy camera through his rise to a staff position on *Look* magazine. He also did the photography for *The Steps of Bonhoeffer* and collaborated with Dr. Clyde Kilby, professor of English on *C. S. Lewis: Images of His World*.
- The Student Missionary Project has chosen Dave Wilder as its chairman for 1974-75. His responsibilities will include debriefing arrangements, chapels, publicity, application and selection procedures, placement, orientation, a retreat, and all travel arrangements for next year's group. Wilder is a senior at Wheaton this year.



The College was in the path of a fierce wind and rain storm in early summer and suffered a good deal of damage to trees and two buildings. Over ten trees were damaged extensively and had to be replaced, roof tiles on Williston Dorm were blown off, and a few stones were displaced on Blanchard Hall Tower. Physical plant director, Ron Cronk, estimated damages at between \$3,000 and \$4,000.

- Doug Meye and Lois McCloskey were chosen as student government president and vice-president for 1974-75. An honor student, Doug served last year as vice-president of the student government and was the student government class representative during his sophomore year. He is also the recipient of the \$1,000 senior scholarship given by the Alumni Association. Lois was the sophomore homecoming hostess in 1972-73. Dave Durantine has been named editor of *Record* and will serve until March 1975. An economics major, Durantine has previously served as production manager and assistant editor.
- Mrs. Jean Kline, professor of psychology, has been named to direct a survey and upgrade drug abuse education programs in DuPage County schools. A \$5,000 grant has been announced by the U.S. Office of Education, to conduct this survey. Mrs. Kline said that "Our purpose is to find out what the schools are teaching about drug abuse, to make schools aware of each other's programs, and to suggest how the programs might be improved."

LEWIS' WARDROBE NOW ON CAMPUS



by Dr. C. S. Kilby,
Curator of
Marion E. Wade
Collection

Perhaps the most famous wardrobe in the U.S. is now on display at Wheaton. It was purchased at auction last October at Banbury, England, when the household effects of C. S. Lewis were sold. It has now arrived from England by freighter, along with three other pieces of furniture. The wardrobe is associated with Lewis' famous Narnia stories, published in the 1950s, which have become increasingly popular and now are considered children's classics.

This wardrobe stood in the hallway at Lewis' home outside Oxford and is thought to have been the model for the magical wardrobe through which the Pevensie children began their wonderful adventures in a land called Narnia, adventures that great numbers of children, and adults, love. One adult reader said that these books hit her "like rain in the desert."

The wardrobe, including hinges and nails, was made in Ireland by Lewis' grandfather. The boards were adzed and the doors elaborately carved. It will become a part of the Marion E. Wade Memorial Collection at Wheaton where more than nine hundred original letters by Lewis are housed, along with some of his manuscripts, his books, and a great variety of materials about him.

After *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe* was published in 1950, children wrote to Lewis asking him to explain how the wardrobe became magical. Lewis then wrote *The Magician's Nephew* partly to explain how Digory Kirke brought back a wonderful apple from a glorious garden in Narnia. This apple helped cure his mother of a serious illness. Digory buried the core of it in his back yard. Years later when a great storm blew the tree down it was made into a wardrobe. When the Pevensie children were evacuated to the country because of the bombing of London, they accidentally discovered that they could go through it into Narnia. There they met Aslan, the great Lion, and Aslan, after destroying the White Witch, made the children kings and queens of that land and gave them many adventures.

ALUMNI QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTIONS

In an effort to collect data on Wheaton's 21,000 alumni, a survey-opinion form has been included in this month's magazine. Your thoughtful response to the instrument is solicited.

Although there have been previous samplings of classes and alumni opinion, this is the first time an opportunity is given *all* alumni to respond.

Returns will be totaled by computer, write-ins will be individually reviewed and classified, and all information will be stored for future use.



The questionnaire refers to the College "Statement of Faith." A copy appears on this page. WHEATON ALUMNI will report findings from the survey.

The form is addressed for return. Please: 1) fold appropriately, 2) staple or tape, and 3) add postage. Your contribution of a postage stamp, while it is not a sizable individual investment, constitutes significant savings for the Alumni Association and the College.

Thank you for your help.

SPECIAL NOTE: If both husband and wife are alumni:

- Mark the questionnaire twice
- Husband using "x"
- Wife using "√"

Statement of Faith

To maintain its commitment to Biblical truth, Wheaton College retains the doctrinal statement which was adopted in 1926 and is reaffirmed annually by the administration and faculty:

We believe in the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testaments as verbally inspired by God and inerrant in the original writing, and that they are of supreme and final authority in faith and life.

We believe in one God, eternally existing in three persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

We believe that Jesus Christ was begotten by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, and is true God and true man.

We believe that man was created in the image of God; that he sinned, and thereby incurred, not only physical death, but also that spiritual death which is separation from God; and that all human beings are born with a sinful nature, and, in the case of those who reach moral responsibility, become sinners in thought, word and deed.

We believe that the Lord Jesus Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, as a representative and substitutionary sacrifice; and that all who believe in Him are justified on the ground of His shed blood.

We believe in the resurrection of the crucified body of our Lord, in His ascension into Heaven, and in His present life there for us, as High Priest and Advocate.

We believe in "that blessed hope," the personal, premillennial, and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

We believe that all who receive by faith the Lord Jesus Christ are born again of the Holy Spirit, and thereby become children of God.

We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and the unjust, the everlasting blessedness of the saved, and the everlasting punishment of the lost.

... and they were blessed

Wheaton's president brings greetings to the assembled Wheatonites. Dr. Armerding was actively involved in the preparation of the Lausanne Covenant which many participants signed before leaving the Congress.



new people, a new community. "In this community there is a new attitude to money and property, to power and its exercise. It is a community where human barriers and prejudices have been overcome under Christ's rule. It is a community ready to suffer for justice and good.

... That these characteristics are to be seen in our lives. We are members of this community, whether we be characteristic of Christ's teachings or the world around us.

... That as part of this community, the body of Jesus Christ, we represent 27% of the world population. By the year 2000 we now can project about 33% of the world as being "Christian" in belief. This growth does not indicate that our lifestyle is lifechanging or that the Gospel is Good News. Let us open ourselves to change in our lifestyle that we may have a revolutionary effect in changing men, and thus society.

We have been trained in the Scriptures, we have learned the power of God through prayer, we have seen the non-Christian world around us, we have shared in the excitement of introducing Christ to a seeking person. Let us run the race—all the way to the finish line. □



Dr. Rene Padilla '57, MA'60, of South America, singled out Abe VanderPuy '41, DD'65 for special thanks as the person pointing him originally towards Wheaton, and spoke of Wheaton's impact on his life as a student.



Ted Ward '51 (right) makes a point to Art Johnston '49, MA'51 while Ted's wife, the former Margaret Hockett '52, looks on.



Pius Wakatama '74, of Rhodesia testified to God's blessing in his life in working with God's people. "God is doing great things in Africa. We ask for prayer to be able to reap the harvest."



Wheaton chaplain Pat Patterson '40 emceed the time of warm fellowship and good food.

"Christians must regain the sense of direction, the feeling of urgency and the depth of conviction which gave birth to the powerful slogan, 'The Evangelization of the World in this Generation'."

Rev. Billy Graham '43, LittD '56





INTRODUCTION

We, members of the Church of Jesus Christ, from more than 150 nations, participants in the International Congress On World Evangelization at Lausanne, praise God for his great salvation and rejoice in the fellowship he has given us with himself and with each other. We are deeply stirred by what God is doing in our day, moved to penitence by our failures and challenged by the unfinished task of evangelization. We believe the gospel is God's good news for the whole world, and we are determined by his grace to obey Christ's commission to proclaim it to all mankind and to make disciples of every nation. We desire, therefore, to affirm our faith and our resolve, and to make public our covenant.

1. THE PURPOSE OF GOD

We affirm our belief in the one eternal God, Creator and Lord of the world, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, who governs all things according to the purpose of his will. He has been calling out from the world a people for himself, and sending his people back into the world to be his servants and his witnesses, for the extension of his kingdom, the building up of Christ's body, and the glory of his name. We confess with shame that we have often denied our calling and failed in our mission, by becoming conformed to the world or by withdrawing from it. Yet we rejoice that even when borne by earthen vessels the gospel is still a precious treasure. To the task of making that treasure known in the power of the Holy Spirit we desire to dedicate ourselves anew.

(Isa. 40:28; Matt. 28:19; Eph. 1:11; Acts 15:14; John 17:6,18; Eph. 4:12; 1 Cor. 5:10; Rom. 12:2; 11 Cor. 4:7)

2. THE AUTHORITY AND POWER OF THE BIBLE

We affirm the divine inspiration, truthfulness and authority of both Old and New Testament Scriptures in their entirety as the only written word of God, without error in all that it affirms, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice. We also affirm the power of God's word to accomplish his purpose of salvation. The message of the Bible is addressed to all mankind. For God's revelation in Christ and in Scripture is unchangeable. Through it the Holy Spirit still speaks today. He illumines the minds of God's people in every culture to perceive its truth freshly through their own eyes and thus discloses to the whole church ever more of the many-coloured wisdom of God.

(11 Tim. 3:16; 11 Pet. 1:21; John 10:35; Isa. 55:11; 1 Cor. 1:21; Rom. 1:16; Matt. 5:17,18; Jude 3; Eph. 1:17,18; 3:10, 18)

3. THE UNIQUENESS AND UNIVERSALITY OF CHRIST

We affirm that there is only one Saviour and only one gospel, although there is a wide diversity of evangelistic approaches. We recognize that all men have some knowledge of God through his general revelation in nature. But we deny that this can save, for men suppress the truth by their unrighteousness. We also reject as derogatory to Christ and the gospel every kind of syncretism and dialogue which implies that Christ speaks equally through all religions and ideologies. Jesus Christ, being himself the only God-man, who gave himself as the only ransom for sinners, is the only mediator between God and man. There is no other name by which we must be saved. All men are perishing because of sin, but God loves all men, not wishing that any should perish but that all should repent. Yet those who reject Christ repudiate the joy of salvation and condemn themselves to eternal separation from God. To proclaim Jesus as "the Saviour of the world" is not to affirm that all men are either automatically or ultimately saved, still less to affirm that all religions offer salvation in Christ. Rather it is to proclaim God's love for a world of sinners and to invite all men to respond to him as Saviour and Lord in the wholehearted personal commitment of repentance and faith. Jesus Christ has been exalted above every other name; we long for the day when every knee shall bow to him and every tongue shall confess him Lord.

(Gal. 1:6-9; Rom. 1:18-32; 1 Tim. 2:5,6; Acts 4:12; John 3:16-19; 11 Pet. 3:9; 11 Thess. 1:7-9; John 4:42; Matt. 11:28; Eph. 1:20, 21; Phil. 2:9-11)

4. THE NATURE OF EVANGELISM

To evangelize is to spread the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sins and was raised from the dead according to the Scriptures, and that as the reigning Lord he now offers the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gift of the Spirit to all who repent and believe. Our Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism, and so is that kind of dialogue whose purpose is to listen sensitively in order to understand. But evangelism itself is the proclamation of the historical, biblical Christ as Saviour and Lord, with a view to persuading people to come to him personally and so be reconciled to God. In issuing the gospel invitation we have no liberty to conceal the cost of discipleship. Jesus still calls all who would follow him to deny themselves, take up their cross, and identify themselves with his new community. The results of evangelism include obedience to Christ, incorporation into his church and responsible service in the world.

(1 Cor. 15:3,4; Acts 2:32-39; John 20:21; 1 Cor. 1:23; 11 Cor. 4,5; 5:11,20; Luke 14:25-33; Mark 8:34; Acts 2:40,47; Mark 10:43-45)

5. CHRISTIAN SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

We affirm that God is both the Creator and the Judge of all men. We therefore should share his concern for justice and reconciliation throughout human society and for the liberation of men from every kind of oppression. Because mankind is made in the image of God, every person, regardless of race, religion, colour, culture, class, sex or age, has an intrinsic dignity because of which he should be respected and served, not exploited. Here too we express penitence both for our neglect and for having sometimes regarded evangelism and social concern as mutually exclusive. Although reconciliation with man is not reconciliation with God, not is social action evangelism, nor is political liberation salvation, nevertheless we affirm that evangelism and socio-political involvement are both part of our Christian duty. For both are necessary expressions of our doctrines of God and man, our love for our neighbour and our obedience to Jesus Christ. The message of salvation implies also a message of judgment upon every form of alienation, oppression and discrimination, and we should not be afraid to denounce evil and

injustice wherever they exist. When people receive Christ they are born again into his kingdom and must seek not only to exhibit but also to spread its righteousness in the midst of an unrighteous world. The salvation we claim should be transforming us in the totality of our personal and social responsibilities. Faith without works is dead.

(Acts 17:26,31; Gen. 18:25; Isa. 1:17; Psa. 45:7; Gen. 1:26,27; Jas. 3:9; Lev. 19:18; Luke 6:27,35; Jas. 2:14-26; John 3:3,5; Matt. 5:20; 6:33; 11 Cor. 3:18; Jas. 2:20)

6. THE CHURCH AND EVANGELISM

We affirm that Christ sends his redeemed people into the world as the Father sent him, and that this calls for a similar deep and costly penetration of the world. We need to break out of our ecclesiastical ghettos and permeate non-Christian society. In the church's mission of sacrificial service evangelism is primary. World evangelization requires the whole church to take the whole gospel to the whole world. The church is at the very centre of God's cosmic purpose and is his appointed means of spreading the gospel. But a church which preaches the cross must itself be marked by the cross. It becomes a stumbling block to evangelism when it betrays the gospel or lacks a living faith in God, a genuine love for people, or scrupulous honesty in all things including promotion and finance. The church is the community of God's people rather than an institution, and must not be identified with any particular culture, social or political system, or human ideology.

(John 17:18; 20:21; Matt. 28:19,20; Acts 1:8; 20:27; Eph. 1:9,10; 3:9-11; Gal. 6:14,17; 11 Cor. 6:13,14; 11 Tim. 2:19-21; Phil. 1:27)

7. COOPERATION IN EVANGELISM

We affirm that the church's visible unity in truth is God's purpose. Evangelism also summons us to unity, because our oneness strengthens our witness, just as our disunity undermines our gospel of reconciliation. We recognize, however, that organizational unity may take many forms and does not necessarily forward evangelism. Yet we who share the same biblical faith should be closely united in fellowship, work and witness. We confess that our testimony has sometimes been marred by sinful individualism and needless duplication. We pledge ourselves to seek a deeper unity in truth, worship, holiness and mission. We urge the development of regional and functional cooperation for the furtherance of the church's mission, for strategic planning, for mutual encouragement, and for the sharing of resources and experience.

(John 17:21,23; Eph. 4:3,4; John 13:35; Phil. 1:27; John 17:11-23)

8. CHURCHES IN EVANGELISTIC PARTNERSHIP

We rejoice that a new missionary era has dawned. The dominant role of western missions is fast disappearing. God is raising up from the younger churches a great new resource for world evangelization, and is thus demonstrating that the responsibility to evangelize belongs to the whole body of Christ. All churches should therefore be asking God and themselves what they should be doing both to reach their own area and to send missionaries to other parts of the world. A re-evaluation of our missionary responsibility and role should be continuous. Thus a growing partnership of churches will develop and the universal character of Christ's church will be more clearly exhibited. We also thank God for agencies which labour in Bible translation, theological education, the mass media, Christian literature, evangelism, missions, church renewal and other specialist fields. They too should engage in constant self-examination to evaluate their effectiveness as part of the Church's mission.

(Rom. 1:8; Phil. 1:5; 4:15; Acts 13:1-3; 1 Thess. 1:6-8)

9. THE URGENCY OF THE EVANGELISTIC TASK

More than 2,700 million people, which is more than two-thirds of mankind, have yet to be evangelized. We are ashamed that so many have been neglected; it is a standing rebuke to us and to the whole church. There is now, however, in many parts of the world an unprecedented receptivity to the Lord Jesus Christ. We are convinced that this is the time for churches and parachurch agencies to pray earnestly for the salvation of the unreached and to launch new efforts to achieve world evangelization. A reduction of foreign missionaries and money in an evangelized country may sometimes be necessary to facilitate the national church's growth in self-reliance and to release resources for unevangelized areas. Missionaries should flow ever more freely from and to all six continents in a spirit of humble service. The goal should be, by all available means and at the earliest possible time, that every person will have the opportunity to hear, understand, and receive the good news. We cannot hope to attain this goal without sacrifice. All of us are shackled by the poverty of millions and disturbed by the injustices which cause it. Those of us who live in affluent circumstances accept our duty to develop a simple life-style in order to contribute more generously to both relief and evangelism.

(John 9:4; Matt. 9:35-38; Rom. 9:1-3; 1 Cor. 9:19-23; Mark 16:15; Isa. 58:6,7; Jas. 1:27; 2:1-9; Matt. 25:31-46; Acts 2:44,45; 4:34,35)

10. EVANGELISM AND CULTURE

The development of strategies for world evangelization calls for imaginative pioneering methods. Under God, the result will be the rise of churches deeply rooted in Christ and closely related to their culture. Culture must always be tested and judged by Scripture. Because man is God's creature, some of his culture is rich in beauty and goodness. Because he has fallen, all of it is tainted with sin and some of it is demonic. The gospel does not presuppose the superiority of any culture to another, but evaluates all cultures according to its own criteria of truth and righteousness, and insists on total absolutes in every culture. Missions have all too frequently exported with the gospel an alien culture, and churches have sometimes been in bondage to culture rather than to the Scripture. Christ's evangelists must humbly seek to empty themselves of all but their personal authenticity in order to become the servants of others, and churches must seek to transform and enrich culture, all for the glory of God.

(Mark 7:8,9,13; Gen. 4:21,22; 1 Cor. 9:19-23; Phil. 2:5-7; 11 Cor. 4:5)

11. EDUCATION AND LEADERSHIP

We confess that we have sometimes pursued church growth at the expense of church depth, and divorced evangelism from Christian nurture. We also acknowledge that some of our missions have been too slow to equip and encourage national leaders to assume their rightful responsibilities. Yet we are committed to indigenous principles, and long that every church will have national leaders who manifest a Christian style of leadership in terms not of domination but of service. We recognize that there is a great need to improve theological education, especially for church leaders. In every nation and culture there should be an effective training programme for pastors and laymen in doctrine, discipleship, evangelism, nurture and service. Such training programmes should not rely on any stereotyped methodology but should be developed by creative local initiatives according to biblical standards.

(Col. 1:27, 28; Acts 14:23; Tit. 1:5,9; Mark 10:42-45; Eph. 4:11,12)

12. SPIRITUAL CONFLICT

We believe that we are engaged in constant spiritual warfare with the principalities and powers of evil, who are seeking to overthrow the church and frustrate its task of world evangelization. We know our need to equip ourselves with God's armour and to fight this battle with the spiritual weapons of truth and prayer. For we detect the activity of our enemy, not only in false ideologies outside the church, but also inside it in false gospels which twist Scripture and put man in the place of God. We need both watchfulness and discernment to safeguard the biblical gospel. We acknowledge that we ourselves are not immune to worldliness of thought and action, that is, to a surrender to secularism. For example, although careful studies of church growth, both numerical and spiritual, are tight and valuable, we have sometimes neglected them. At other times, desirous to ensure a response to the gospel, we have compromised our message, manipulated our hearers through pressure techniques, and become unduly preoccupied with statistics or even dishonest in our use of them. All this is worldly. The church must be in the world; the world must not be in the church.

(Eph. 6:12; 11 Cor. 4:3,4; Eph. 6:11,13-18; 11 Cor 10:3-5; 1 John 2:18-26, 4:1-3; Gal. 1:6-9; 11 Cor. 2:17, 4:2; John 17:15)

13. FREEDOM AND PERSECUTION

It is the God-appointed duty of every government to secure conditions of peace, justice and liberty in which the church may obey God, serve the Lord Christ, and preach the gospel without interference. We therefore pray for the leaders of the nations and call upon them to guarantee freedom of thought and conscience, and freedom to practise and propagate religion in accordance with the will of God and as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We also express our deep concern for all who have been unjustly imprisoned, and especially for our brethren who are suffering for their testimony to the Lord Jesus. We promise to pray and work for their freedom. At the same time we refuse to be intimidated by their fate. God helping us, we too will seek to stand against injustice and to remain faithful to the gospel, whatever the cost. We do not forget the warnings of Jesus that persecution is inevitable.

(1 Tim. 1:1-4; Acts 4:19, 5:29; Col. 3:24; Heb. 13:1-3; Luke 4:18; Gal. 5:11, 6:12; Matt. 5:10-12; John 15:18-21)

14. THE POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

We believe in the power of the Holy Spirit. The Father sent his Spirit to bear witness to his Son; without his witness ours is futile. Conviction of sin, faith in Christ, new birth and Christian growth are all his work. Further, the Holy Spirit is a missionary spirit; thus evangelism should arise spontaneously from a spirit-filled church. A church that is not a missionary church is contradicting itself and quenching the Spirit. Worldwide evangelization will become a realistic possibility only when the Spirit renews the church in truth and wisdom, faith, holiness, love and power. We therefore call upon all Christians to pray for such a visitation of the sovereign Spirit of God that all his fruit may appear in all his people and that all his gifts may enrich the body of Christ. Only then will the whole church become a fit instrument in his hands, that the whole earth may hear his voice.

(1 Cor. 2:4; John 15:26,27, 16:8-11; 1 Cor. 12:3; John 3:6-8; 11 Cor. 3:18; John 7:37-39; 1 Thess. 5:19; Acts 1:8; Psa. 85:4-7, 67:1-3; Gal. 5:22,23; 1 Cor. 12:4-31; Rom. 12:3-8)

15. THE RETURN OF CHRIST

We believe that Jesus Christ will return personally and visibly, in power and glory, to consummate his salvation and his judgment. This promise of his coming is a further spur to our evangelism, for we remember his words that the gospel must first be preached to all nations. We believe that the interim period between Christ's ascension and return is to be filled with the mission of the people of God, who have no liberty to stop before the End. We also remember his warning that false Christs and false prophets will arise as precursors of the final Antichrist. We therefore reject as a proud, self-confident dream the notion that man can ever build a utopia on earth. Our Christian confidence is that God will perfect his kingdom, and we look forward with eager anticipation to that day, and to the new heaven and earth in which righteousness will dwell and God will reign for ever. Meanwhile, we rededicate ourselves to the service of Christ and of men in joyful submission to his authority over the whole of our lives.

(Mark 14:62; Heb. 9:28; Mark 13:10; Acts 1:8-11; Matt. 24:20; Mark 13:21-23; John 2:18, 4:1-3; Luke 12:32; Rev. 21:1-5; 11 Pet. 3:13; Matt. 28:18)

CONCLUSION

Therefore, in the light of this our faith and our resolve, we enter into a solemn covenant with God and with each other, to pray, to plan and to work together for the evangelization of the whole world. We call upon others to join us. May God help us by his grace and for his glory to be faithful to this our covenant! Amen, Alleluia!



Signed: _____

Date: _____

CONGRESS INFORMATION

LAUSANNE
7
INTERNATIONAL
CONGRESS ON
WORLD
EVANGELIZATION

BULLETIN
NUMBER

6

16-25 JULY 1974

4000 Attend Historic Lausanne '74

LAUSANNE '74 assembled more Christians leaders from more countries, more churches, and more evangelistic organisations than probably any conference in Christian history. Officially 2,473 were registered participants, but observers, wives, visitors, guests, and staff brought the total to almost 4,000 from 150 nations and over 135 denominations.

Many testified that the closing communion service was the most moving service they had ever attended. And despite the Rev. John Stott's caution that it should be done only after prayerful deliberation, over 2,200 persons signed the *Lausanne Covenant* before leaving Lausanne, and many sent their signature cards later. The *Covenant* seems to have caught the mood of evangelical Christians around the world. Interest in it is growing daily, and requests for hundreds of copies in many languages are coming to the office weekly.

Already thousands of report meetings on Lausanne have been held around the world, and many new efforts of

evangelism are already begun. One participant reported "thousands of conversions" already from a new effort in his responsive area. But the immensity of the task before us was revealed by the Congress sponsored "Unreached Peoples" survey which spotlighted the locations of more than two and one half billion unevangelized persons. And the population counter in the Congress lobby registered 1,852,857 persons born during the Congress sessions alone and 590,193,076 persons born since the Berlin Congress of 1966.

The final report of the Sunday LAUSTADE rally indicates there were more than 30,000 persons crowding the Olympic stadium. At least 650 clear decisions to accept Christ as Saviour were recorded of which approximately 10% were children. The Sunday afternoon offering of \$57,000 has been given in its entirety to Africa: one half for relief work in the Sahara and one half to evangelistic projects.

No one Congress message has received more response than others, testifying to the balance of the Congress program which met the needs of all

groups. Even liberal critics have commended the balanced emphases between evangelism and social concern, Gospel proclamation and presence. Speakers are receiving continued responses to their messages. Many seminars and "demonstration" group leaders have reported overflow attendances and deep continuing interest.

All participants met their homeward-bound planes on time except two: Dr. José Fajardo of Colombia, S.A., suffered a stroke on the second day of the Congress and spent the entire time in the hospital. But God restored his strength, and he returned home two weeks after the Congress. Dr. Frank Khair-Ullah from Pakistan was struck by a taxi on July 24th and has been hospitalized with many broken bones and internal injuries since then. Praising the Lord in this experience, he is now recovering well and should be home in late October.

Congress wives totalled 384, and the special programs and tours planned for them by Mrs. Donald Hoke were enthusiastically received. Over 650 women from the Congress and city attended a tea to hear Mrs. Billy Graham speak on "the Role of a Christian leader's Wife". One wife wrote back, "I've been in Christian service for 21 years, but this time with the women of the Congress transformed my life".

The spirit and commitment of nearly all Congress attendants — as concretely evidenced by the signatures to the *Lausanne Covenant* — seem to predict that hundreds of great new evangelistic efforts to reach the world's swelling population will be initiated by Congress participants in the days to come. The Congress motto "Let the Earth Hear His Voice" struck responsive chords in the hearts of all that aggressive evangelism is the will of God for this hour as we wait and work for the coming of Christ. Surely Lausanne '74 will be remembered as one of the most significant gatherings in Christian history.

CONTINUATION COMMITTEE ELECTED

At the final Planning Committee meeting on October 18 the Lausanne '74 Continuation Committee was elected. As discussed and approved at the Congress, this Committee will seek ways to extend the ministry and spirit of Lausanne '74 for world evangelization.

Dr. Billy Graham was elected Convening Chairman of the Continuation Committee which will meet in Mexico City, January 20-24, 1975. As the Planning Committee carefully deliberated, it was found impossible to represent the world's churches with only 25 representatives, so 48 members were elected to the Continuation Committee from names submitted by the Congress (plus several specially appointed as agreed). These men will decide on the type of organization, then elect officers, establish goals, and outline plans for the Continuation Committee. The members are as follows:

Dr. Saphir P. Athyal — India
Prof. Peter Beyerhaus — W. Germany
Mr. Henri Blocher — France
Mrs. Vonette Bright — USA
Mr. Michael Cassidy — S. Africa
Dr. Kenneth Chafin — USA
Dr. Laurence Chia — Singapore
Dr. Chongnam Cho — Korea
Dr. Robert E. Coleman — USA

Bishop A. Jack Dain — Australia
Rev. Antoine Deeb — Lebanon
Dr. Leighton Ford — USA
Dr. Nilson Fanini — Brazil
Dr. Mariano di Gangi — Canada
D., Akira Hatori — Japan
Dr. Donald E. Hoke — USA
Mr. Armin Hoppler — Switzerland

Continuation p. 2

GREETINGS...

**A. JACK
DAIN**

EXECUTIVE
CHAIRMAN



It is three months since the Congress closed, and we are all scattered to our homes in every corner of the globe. Looking back upon the days we spent together, there is so much for which we can humbly thank God, but I would like to express personally my gratitude to Dr. Hoke, every member of the staff, the chairmen of committees, members, and not least, the stewards and honorary helpers. It was the devoted services of this large group of people that made the whole Congress possible.

In the days that followed it was sad to see all the Congress paraphernalia stripped away, but we were constantly reminded that the Congress was not a place but People meeting around a Person and commissioned afresh with Power for our joint task in the world to which we have returned.

There are several matters which I would earnestly commend to your prayers in the days immediately ahead.

1. Dr. Khair-Ullah who was seriously injured in a road accident on the closing night of the Congress and who will be in hospital for some weeks yet. I am glad to report that it has now been possible for his wife to join him in Lausanne.
2. The Continuation Committee which will meet in January next year.
3. The small staff in several offices in the United States and Europe who are handling follow-up materials.

I am deeply grateful for the continuing flow of letters, all of which speak of how much the Congress has meant to you individually. We must now pray that in our lives, in our own churches, in our organisations, and in our own countries there may be the « signs following ». Already it is encouraging to hear of steps that have been taken to implement the vision of the Congress as it is enshrined in the **Covenant**.

May I remind you all that the One who commissioned us afresh in that closing service is the One who is still « the same yesterday, today, and forever ». Now may the God of Peace... make you perfect in every good work to do his will... to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

**DONALD
HOKE**

DIRECTOR



Now that the Congress is over in Lausanne, it has really just begun! The last stage in the Congress process — the implementing of the vision and strategy of Lausanne '74 — is now in your hands, and you are in the hands of the Holy Spirit to accomplish God's will in world evangelization.

I am personally thrilled to have heard from many of you already how the Holy Spirit blessed you at the Congress, and how He is already using you to initiate new programs of evangelism. God is at work. Lives have been changed. Let us daily sing « Alleluia » for what He is doing and will do around the world.

The great instrument of continued, increasing blessing will be prayer — prayer by multiplied thousands of individuals and groups around the world who have caught the vision of the possibility of total world evangelization in our generation. Will you share widely the important requests in the Prayer Box on page 4 of this Bulletin?

As you read this, the Continuation Committee will have been elected. On them the responsibility to assist Christians around the world in implementing the message, vision, and strategy of Lausanne '74 rests. Please pray especially for them that God will guide them to a plan and supply the financial needs necessary to carry it out.

The Congress staff is thankful for the privilege of serving you during the Congress. Now all are dispersed in service for Christ around the world. I personally will be happy to help you in the future however I can. I'll be glad to answer your letters and questions, and I will be happy to visit you for conferences or lectures on the topics of Lausanne, as my future schedule permits. Please feel free to write me about this.

One phrase from the Congress often echoes in my heart, « **God! Do it again!** » I pray for myself and for you that what God did for us all at Lausanne He will do again and again in our hearts, stirring us daily to prayer and witness that « this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness and then the end shall come ». (Matthew 24. 14).

Continuation of p. 1

Dr. Josip Horak — Yugoslavia
The Rev. Juan M. Isais — Mexico
Dr. Byang H. Kato — Kenya
Dr. James Kennedy — USA
Dr. Billy Graham
Mr. B. U. Khokhar — Pakistan
Bishop Festo Kivengere — Uganda
The Rev. Samuel O. Libert — Argentina
Dr. Harold Lindsell — USA
Mrs. M. Mapalieu — Indonesia
Dr. Stanley Mooneyham — USA
The Rev. Gottfried Osei-Mensah — Kenya

Rev. Petrus Octavianus — Indonesia
Dr. Ted. Raedeke — USA
Bishop N. D. A. Samuel — India
Mr. Peter Schneider — W. Germany
The Rev. M. L. Scott, Jr. — USA
Dr. Philip Teng — Hong Kong
Bishop Erling Utnem — Norway
Rev. C. Peter Wagner — USA
Dr. Ben I. Wati — India
Miss Florence Yeboah — Ghana
Dr. Thos F. Zimmerman — USA
Rev. Isac Zokue — Central Africa Rep.

WORLD RE...

I cannot begin to think what impact for good the Congress is going to make on our East African scene. The possibilities are tremendous. We have worked out several strategies and, under God, we intend to use all our present excellent opportunities to share the vision and gains of Lausanne with the entire Christian community, and to mobilize for effective evangelization.

PASTOR — EAST AFRICA

On the very first day of the Congress I made contact with leaders in an adjoining nation that will open it to gospel radio and literature on an entirely new scale.

PARTICIPANT — MISSIONARY

Perhaps the greatest achievement after the Lausanne Event, will be the proposed Arab Congress on Evangelism. Before leaving Lausanne, church leaders from the Arab countries have asked me to pursue the same until it becomes a matter of fact. My forthcoming personal visits to eight Mid-Eastern countries will give me the chance to make further studies.

EVANGELIST — MIDDLE EAST

The Dominican delegation have decided to take information of this event to our respective denominations, each Christian meeting that we attend, all pastors and leaderships by a circular letter, in four pastors meetings convened to give details about the Congress and to show pictures, papers and the Lausanne agreement. The proposed is to transmit to our brothers the Congress's Spirit, so that all of us will responsabilize ourselves in world evangelization.

PARTICIPANT — DOMINICAN REP.

We have taken the decision to launch immediately into a wide spread cassette ministry in Mozambique. Doors have suddenly opened. We do not know for how long. We are therefore going to place as many cassette players as possible in the strategic centres of Mozambique in as short a time as possible.

MISSIONARY — MOZAMBIQUE

Immediately after the Congress ended a number of evangelicals in the confessional churches of Europe met at Aigle, Switzerland, for a day conference to discuss together how we may better carry out our evangelistic responsibilities in our nations. We have decided to start off a major evangelical theologians' conference probably in April 1976 that we trust will unite and support evangelical theological thinking and action on a Europe-wide basis.

PARTICIPANT — SWITZERLAND

I wish to say that news of the Congress are being presented in all my radio programmes, and at all my



Recalling 10 wonderful days...

REPORTS ON LAUSANNE...

public appearances, because I consider it was an enormous advance which we made together in the direction of defending the faith.

BIBLE SOCIETY PRESIDENT — BRASIL

The International Congress was in every way a superbly planned organization, but of course, very much more than that, I believe its spiritual purposes and objectives were wonderfully fulfilled at the Congress itself as a beginning and are already continuing to be worked out in the Church of the participants.

MISSIONARY SOCIETY LEADER — NEW ZEALAND

We are planning to organize regional continuation committees, because we see the real heart of this work in the cross-fertilization of ideas coming from our evangelical leaders. I believe that these regional committees will be able to make good use of the papers of Lausanne, with real devotion to the truth of God, looking for a new strategy under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

PARTICIPANT — ARGENTINA

Seven South Pacific Islands participants prepared a document consisting of a fourpoint recommendation from them to their respective churches and included a 17-point statement of exhortation to evangelism.

DENOMINATIONAL SECRETARY — FIJI

We have already organized Prayer Cells in 900 churches and many other gospel teams so as to cover many areas and places. The result is very effective... thousands are turning to Christ.

SECRETARY - MISSIONARY ORGANIZATION - INDIA

PERSONAL TESTIMONIES

Things ARE different now — my vision of His work is clearer, my burden for souls greater, my tears for the perishing more in number. Would to God that it will not stop here! It would be a tragedy if it did! I am continuing to pray that the time and money spent on me would be an investment for eternity. Lausanne helped me to see myself and the world as He sees; it has also impressed me that the «King's business requireth haste».

PARTICIPANT — INDIA

My head is bubbling with ideas. I cannot wait to get back to Liberia to put them into action. I believe the whole church of Liberia will be changed as a result of this Congress. BISHOP — AFRICA

I have gained more here than I will be able to have the strength to execute in the next hundred years. I cannot wait to get back to my country and put the things into action that I have learned here.

PARTICIPANT — IVORY COAST

The Congress has deeply renewed my spiritual life. I have a feeling that his this renewal will last. Words cannot express my deep gratitude. It has helped me to find again the value of regular and daily personal worship which I have somehow neglected due to other activities. I have a larger and «enriched» vision of evangelization.

PASTOR — FRANCE

I was encouraged to evangelize boldly without fear. In a taxi in our country I was with five persons. After a short prayer that the Holy Spirit would lead me to start telling the non-Christians about Christ, one of them caught my arm and said to say something. I opened my mouth and talked to them frankly for three hours about Jesus the only Savior, and the five were convinced and promised to read the Bible.

PARTICIPANT — SYRIA

I went to Lausanne rather sceptical that God could do anything at this time, feeling that such a vast meeting could really accomplish very little, but in God's goodness He turned the tables and I must confess that this meeting was one of the key gatherings in my lifetime. We are in your debt for the coming generation.

THEOLOGICAL PROFESSOR — LATIN AMERICA

LAUSANNE COVENANT

The Lausanne Covenant is probably the finest document that I have seen anywhere in terms of expressing the true feelings of our evangelical point of view.

PASTOR — USA

I continue to be amazed at the continuing impact of the Congress, particularly of the Covenant which is going like mad all over the world.

USA

The Lausanne Covenant, final document of the Congress on World Evangelization, has created a very interesting debate in the midst of the Missions and Evangelism Committee (WCC). It recommended that a large place should be made to all documents of this Congress and that this Covenant should be considered as a «basic document» for the 5th Assembly.

W.C.C. NEWSLETTER

WHERE TO WRITE FOR FOLLOW-UP MATERIALS

Since the Congress office in Lausanne is now closed, please write to the following places for information and materials. Please note that the printed materials will be available only in English and German.

A. CONGRESS PRINTED MATERIALS :

1. In English : Lausanne Covenant, Compendium Book, and Reaching All booklets.
International Congress on World Evangelization
P. O. Box 1240 Minneapolis
Minnesota 55440, USA
2. In German : Compendium Book and Reaching All booklets.
c/o International Congress on World Evangelization
607 Langen Postfach 1310 West Germany
Lausanne Covenant only.
c/o German Evangelical Alliance
1 Berlin 4 Albestrasse West Germany
3. In French : Lausanne Covenant.
c/o International Congress on World Evangelization DECISION
15, place de la Nation 75011 Paris France
4. In Spanish : Lausanne Covenant.
c/o International Congress on World Evangelization
c/o Evangelism in Accion, C. P. O. Box 290
Barcelona, Spain

B. CASSETTE TAPES AND COLORED SLIDES :

Available in English only. Order from International Congress on World Evangelization
P. O. Box 1240 Minneapolis
Minnesota 55440, USA

C. PERMISSION TO REPRINT AND/OR TRANSLATE ALL CONGRESS MESSAGES AND LAUSANNE COVENANT MUST BE RECEIVED. Write :

Dr. George Wilson
c/o International Congress on World Evangelization
P. O. Box 1240 Minneapolis
Minnesota 55440, USA

D. QUESTIONS CONCERNING CONTINUATION COMMITTEE OR ANY INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ACTIVITIES.

Dr. Donald E. Hoke
c/o International Congress on World Evangelization
P. O. Box 1240 Minneapolis
Minnesota 55440, USA

Only the Compendium Book with all Congress messages in English and one set of the Reaching All booklets will be sent free to participants — in Africa, Asia, and Latin America only. Tapes and slides must be ordered and paid for from the office named above.

PLEASE USE ORDER FORM ACCOMPANYING THIS BULLETIN FOR ORDERING ALL CONGRESS MATERIALS.



SWISSAIR



Official Congress Airline



Information Sheet and Order Form

A listing of Lausanne Congress materials that are available for purchase from
World Wide Publications, Box 1240, Minneapolis, MN, U.S.A. 55440

LET THE EARTH HEAR HIS VOICE (Congress Compendium Volume)

A compilation of all the plenary papers and responses, Bible studies, strategy and theology of evangelism papers, national and regional reports, personal testimonies, and the Lausanne Covenant. Published in one volume of 1,000 pages. Available December 30, 1974. (English only) Cloth, LEHV, \$9.95 Paper, LEHV, \$7.95

REACHING ALL Study Book

A study book designed for individual or group use. Developed as a tool to be used for exploring the means and methods which can be used in reaching the world for Christ during this generation. Paper, RA, \$4.95.

Each chapter is also available in individual booklet form for 95¢ each.

1. All the World – background of theology
2. All Together – the church's role
3. All People – spanning cultural barriers
4. All Needs – the adequacy of Christ
5. All Means – means and methods
6. All Power – involvement of the Holy Spirit

Available in English now. French, German, Spanish, Japanese, and Chinese will be available January, 1975.

REACHING ALL Cassette Album

A cassette album of six one-hour tapes designed to be used as a companion to the REACHING ALL Study Book. May be used separately, as it is not identical to the book. RAcas, \$24.95.

CONGRESS SLIDES

Professional color 35mm slides of the International Congress of World Evangelization, Lausanne, Switzerland. Box of 25, RA25, \$5.00; box of 50, RA50, \$10.00.

LAUSANNE COVENANT

A 10" x 17" copy of the Lausanne Covenant printed on beige paper. LACOV, 10¢ each; 100/\$8.00; 500/\$30.00.

CONGRESS ADDRESSES

The major plenary addresses given during the Congress are available on cassette. Please specify the speech you wish to purchase by indicating the code. NOTE: All the cassettes have been redone since the Congress. These cassettes are professionally edited, balanced and recorded on quality tape. \$3.95 each.

- | | |
|----------|--|
| DTL-LA01 | Opening Convocation, Jack Dain, Billy Graham |
| DTL-LA02 | "Why Lausanne?" Billy Graham |
| DTL-LA03 | "God at Work Through Men: Stephen" Nilson Fanini |
| DTL-LA04 | "Biblical Authority and Evangelism" Susuma Uda |
| DTL-LA05 | "The Biblical Basis of Evangelism" John Stott |
| DTL-LA06 | "The Dimensions of World Evangelization" Donald McGavran |
| DTL-LA07 | "The Suicide of Man" Harold Lindsell |
| DTL-LA08 | "God at Work Through Men: Ananias and Paul" Philip Teng |
| DTL-LA09 | "Positive and Negative Forces" Panel Discussion |
| DTL-LA10 | "Evangelism and the World" C. René Padilla |
| DTL-LA11 | "God at Work Through Men: Peter and a Roman Officer" Branko Lovrec |
| DTL-LA12 | "Methods and Strategy in the Evangelism of the Early Church" Michael Green |
| DTL-LA13 | "Contemporary Evangelistic Methods" George Peters |
| DTL-LA14 | "In-Depth Evangelism" Panel Discussion |
| DTL-LA15 | "Acts of the Holy Spirit" Stanley Mooneyham |
| DTL-LA16 | "God at Work Through Men: Paul and the Greek Philosophers" Samuel Kamalson |
| DTL-LA17 | "The Highest Priority: Cross-Cultural Evangelism" Ralph Winter and respondents |
| DTL-LA18 | "God at Work in Circumstances: Personal Meetings" Foud Accad |
| DTL-LA19 | "The Holy Spirit in World Evangelization" Osei-Mensah |
| DTL-LA20 | Personal Testimonies: Larry Christenson, Thomas Houston, Festo Kivengere, Juan Ortiz |
| DTL-LA21 | "Devotional Message" Corrie ten Boom |
| DTL-LA22 | Public Meeting at Laustade by Billy Graham |
| DTL-LA23 | "God at Work in Areas of Unknown Possibilities" Manuel Scott |
| DTL-LA24 | "World Evangelization and the Kingdom of God" Peter Beyerhaus |
| DTL-LA25 | "Evangelism and Man's Search for Freedom, Justice and Fulfillment" Samuel Escobar |
| DTL-LA26 | "Laymen Look at World Evangelization" Panel Discussion |
| DTL-LA27 | Introduction to Malcolm Muggeridge by Billy Graham; |
| DTL-LA28 | "Living Through an Apocalypse" Malcolm Muggeridge |
| DTL-LA29 | "God at Work in Times of Persecution" Billy Kim |
| DTL-LA30 | "The Church as God's Agent" Howard Snyder |
| DTL-LA31 | "Form and Freedom in the Church" Francis Schaeffer |
| DTL-LA32 | "The Hard Places of the World" Michael Bordeaux |
| DTL-LA33 | "God at Work in Time of Dramatic Church Growth" Isabella Magalit |
| DTL-LA34 | "The Nature of Biblical Unity" Henri Blocher |
| DTL-LA35 | Congress Committee Reports |
| DTL-LA36 | "The Power of God" E. V. Hill |
| DTL-LA37 | "The Cross and World Evangelism" Festo Kivengere |
| DTL-LA38 | "The King Is Coming" Billy Graham |
| DTL-LA39 | Women's Luncheon Address by Corrie ten Boom |

Order Form

Please send me the following items from the International Congress on World Evangelization:

Quantity	Code	Description	Price each	Total
	LEHV	Let the Earth Hear His Voice, cloth	\$9.95	
	LEHVp	Let the Earth Hear His Voice, paper	7.95	
	*RA	Reaching All book	4.95	
	*RA01	All the World	.95	
	*RA02	All Together	.95	
	*RA03	All People	.95	
	*RA04	All Needs	.95	
	*RA05	All Means	.95	
	*RA06	All Power	.95	
	RAcas	Reaching All cassette album	24.95	
	RA25	Color Slides, box of 25	5.00	
	RA50	Color Slides, box of 50	10.00	
	LACOV	Lausanne Covenant	.10	
	DTL-LA01	Opening Convocation	3.95	
	DTL-LA02	Why Lausanne?	3.95	
	DTL-LA03	Fanini, Uda	3.95	
	DTL-LA04	Stott	3.95	
	DTL-LA05	McGavran, Lindsell	3.95	
	DTL-LA06	Teng, Panel Discussion	3.95	
	DTL-LA07	Padilla	3.95	
	DTL-LA08	Lovrec, Green	3.95	
	DTL-LA09	Peters, Panel Discussion	3.95	
	DTL-LA10	Mooneyham	3.95	
	DTL-LA11	Kamaleson, Winter	3.95	
	DTL-LA12	Accad, Osei-Mensah	3.95	
	DTL-LA13	Testimonies	3.95	
	DTL-LA14	Laustade meeting, Graham	3.95	
	DTL-LA15	Scott, Beyerhaus	3.95	
	DTL-LA16	Escobar	3.95	
	DTL-LA17	Laymen's Panel	3.95	
	DTL-LA18	Muggeridge	3.95	
	DTL-LA19	Kim, Snyder, Schaeffer	3.95	
	DTL-LA20	Bourdeaux	3.95	
	DTL-LA21	Magalit, Blocher	3.95	
	DTL-LA22	Congress Committee Reports	3.95	
	DTL-LA23	Hill	3.95	
	DTL-LA24	Kivengere, Graham	3.95	
	DTL-LA25	Corrie ten Boom (Luncheon speech)	3.95	

*Indicate English, French, German, Spanish, Japanese, or Chinese
 SUB TOTAL
 Postage and Handling add 10% of SUB TOTAL

TOTAL

Please enclose a check or an international money order. Must be in U.S. currency.

Send to:

**world wide
publications**

Box 1240
 Minneapolis, MN 55440

WHAT YOU CAN DO TO EXTEND LAUSANNE '74

You can spread the message and spirit of Lausanne in many ways to inspire Christians and churches to launch new movements of evangelism in your country. Here are just some of those ways many participants have written they are already using to inspire and inform persons in their area that you, too, may be able to use:

1. Write articles on Lausanne '74 for papers and magazines.
2. Distribute widely or reprint the LAUSANNE COVENANT. (See note on page 3 regarding needed permission).
3. Speak about the challenge of Lausanne in churches, Bible classes, women's meetings, youth rallies, theological schools etc.
4. Plan a pastor's conference of several days to hear tapes and messages of Lausanne.
5. Play the Congress tapes to groups and individuals in your area.

6. Reprint parts of Congress messages in your church or denominational papers (permitted).
7. Get reports of Lausanne on local Christian radio broadcasts.
8. Plan a city, area, or national conference on evangelism, using Lausanne material.
9. Share your printed messages with other pastors, evangelists, friends.
10. Tell Christians in your area about the compendium books of Congress messages, and take orders for them.
11. Organise prayer meetings for evangelism among pastors, women, youth, in churches, Bible schools, &c.
12. Pray daily that the fires of evangelism will burn in the hearts of all who attended Lausanne '74 and spread throughout the world.

CONGRESS ATTENDANCE SUMMARY

CONTINENT	PARTICIPANTS									
	Convenors	Participants	TOTAL	Women	Laymen	Youth	OBSERVERS	WIVES	VISITORS GUESTS	TOTAL INCL. 400 PRESS
	(THESE INCLUDED IN PREVIOUS TOTAL)									
AFRICA	21	371	392	25	48	46	51	15	—	458
ASIA	25	558	583	36	63	20	63	16	—	662
CENTRAL AMERICA	6	83	89	6	6	10	10	12	—	111
EUROPE (West)	23	510	533	57	69	86	158	37	14	742
EUROPE (East)	—	33	33	—	—	1	—	1	—	35
MIDDLE EAST	3	54	57	10	17	11	2	3	—	67
NORTH AMERICA USA	26	454	480	66	76	70	202	204	10	896
CANADA	5	62	67	9	—	8	14	27	—	108
OCEANIA	3	81	84	10	12	8	43	23	—	150
SOUTH AMERICA	17	138	155	4	10	10	17	8	—	180
TOTAL OF ABOVE	129	2344	2473	223	301	270	560	346	24	3803

Summary of Denominations

Anglican and Church of England	164
Baptist	658
Brethren	136
Christian & Missionary Alliance	91
Evangelical	324
Independent & Interdenominational	136
Lutheran	229
Methodist	222
Presbyterian	339
Total No. of Denominations	135

Congress Total Registrations

Total of all categories above	3 803
Stewards	175
GRAND TOTAL	3 978

Language Preferences Indicated

1. English	2 780	76 % (approximately)
2. German	280	8 %
3. Spanish	265	7 %
4. French	220	6 %
5. Japanese	80	2 %
6. Indonesian	50	1 %

PRAY

Let us continue the wonderful fellowship of Lausanne '74 by daily prayer for its goals. One fruitful result can be the organizing of thousands of prayer-groups to pray for world evangelization. Will you gather Christians in your area to pray for these requests?

1. That everyone who attended Lausanne '74 may be used to inspire churches, organizations, and individuals to great new efforts in evangelism around the world.
2. For revival to come to churches of the world that each will become involved in aggressive programs of E1, E2 and E3 evangelism.
3. That great new or renewed movements of evangelism may begin in every nation.
4. That each Congress participant may be faithful to his covenant « with God and with each other to pray, to plan, and to work together for the evangelization of the whole world ». (Lausanne Covenant).
5. That Christians everywhere will become involved in prayer for world evangelization.
6. That every Christian will become an effective personal witness.
7. That with humility and penitence we may recognise our failures in Christian social responsibility and ask God's help to be faithful doing His will in this area.

« Call upon Me and I will show thee great and mighty things that thou knowest not ». (Jeremiah 33.3).

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION Lausanne - Switzerland 16-25, July, 1974

Honorary Chairman
Dr. Billy Graham

Executive Chairman
Bishop A. Jack Dain

Director
Donald E. Hoke

Associate Director, Hospitality
Arthur H. Dominy

Associate Director, Program
Paul E. Little

Associate Director, Participants
Dr. Victor Nelson

Director of Communications
Warwick H. Olson

Associate Director, Arrangements-Services
Bruce R. Ogden

Associate Director, Travel
David Tam

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON WORLD EVANGELIZATION

Post Office Box 1240
Minneapolis
Minnesota 55440, USA



A MONTHLY LETTER ABOUT EVANGELISM
MONATLICHER INFORMATIONSBRIEF ÜBER EVANGELISATION
LETTRE MENSUELLE SUR L'ÉVANGÉLISATION

No. 8, August 1974

A RESPONSE TO LAUSANNE

I had the privilege to be one of the five WCC staff members who attended the Congress on World Evangelization, Lausanne, 16-25 July, 1974. I actually went to Lausanne with rather pessimistic expectations. Would the Congress not bring a new escalation in the "cold war" between "ecumenical" and "conservative evangelical" Christians? Would the world evangelical movement yield to a minority who had been promoting an apocalyptic anti-Christian image of the ecumenical movement - an image which, to some of us, seemed to be characterized by Carl McIntyre's visions rather than by Scriptural truth?

With deep sympathy I had recently read some issues of The Post-American, a periodical issued by a conservative evangelical group which, I felt, had succeeded in clarifying that the image of evangelicalism as being necessarily associated with Anglo-Saxon, white, middle class political conservatism was wrong, and that conservative biblical theology can imply a progressive political stance.

On the other hand, I was thrilled by William Stringfellow's (I hope he will allow me to claim his name for the "ecumenical camp") Ethic for Christians and Other Strangers in the Land, a book which overcomes what I should call the "ethical bias" which may have prevailed in some of our statements and activities. Stringfellow does away with all optimistic presumptions. He digs biblically deeper into the nature of evil and exposes the demonic powers inherent in social, political and institutional structures: it is not with flesh and blood that we have to fight, but with powers and principalities - and yet Stringfellow, in biblical realism, does not allow the pendulum to swing back into fatalistic pessimism.

What I mean to say is that I felt increasingly that the hardened frontlines were gradually moving, and that therefore I should have deplored it as a tragedy if Lausanne had attempted to deep-freeze the status quo at this point in church history.

In fact I came away from Lausanne with hope and encouragement. The 2,700 Congress participants (plus almost a thousand observers, visitors, journalists, wives, etc.) did not represent a monolithic block "against" anything. For some "radicals" (I feel that we should not reserve this label for the left wing only - there are also rightist radicals) this

may have been a sobering experience; for those concerned with evangelism rather than with ecclesiastical warfare it should have been an experience of the variety and richness of the gifts of grace which God grants to his people.

Though a congress of this magnitude has to be (unfortunately) strictly and professionally organized and so, to a certain extent, does not allow for fighting out conflicts on the stage and in plenaries, there was room and freedom enough for Pentecostals and fundamentalists, for revivalists and cross-cultural missionaries, for church growth organizers and for those deeply concerned with the societal political implications of our faith.

The "dogmatic" framework set at the beginning by Lindsell who depicted a gloomy picture of a world going mad and precipitating into suicide, and by Billy Graham who recommended Jesus Christ as the only leader out of the misery, was a little too simplistic for my complicated soul. But very soon the rough wood-cut print was filled in with colours - not just crayon but bright oil colour too.

I refrain from quoting conference speeches which you can read yourself very soon in the Lausanne documentation. Let me just very subjectively summarize what I personally found to be the most important trends in the Congress:

1. The Lausanne Congress has reaffirmed a critical openness towards the ecumenical movement which conciliar Christians should not interpret as mere diplomatic courtesy, but rather as a hand stretched out towards us. We should recognize that the brethren (by the way, I didn't see too many sisters in influential positions) who organized the Congress were courageous enough to risk a possible split in their own camp with those who had worked hard towards a public condemnation of the WCC.
2. The rejection of Pentecostalism (alongside the ecumenical movement) as it had turned up in some polemics against the Bangkok Conference of the WCC's Commission on World Mission and Evangelism, has not survived Lausanne. World evangelicalism seems to have accepted the charismatic movements (of course as far as they are biblically based) as their own kin (as has the WCC).
3. There is a rapidly growing awareness of the socio-political implications of our Christian faith within the group represented at the Lausanne Congress. We ecumeniacs should be humble enough not to take this trend as a general justification of our own way - we should rather look out for ways of creative cooperation which God may want to open for us together.
4. The voices of Third World churches and their quest for identity could be clearly heard at Lausanne, though not yet as clearly as, say, in Bangkok. I dare to say that in this regard the ecumenical movement is still some big steps ahead of the evangelicals. Again, no reason for us to be complacent. We too, in spite of better theory (and perhaps some better practice), are still divided into donors and receivers. We should prepare the funeral of the Constantinian era together - or rather the new church after the funeral.

5. As could be expected, Lausanne has strengthened the evangelistic zeal of many people and, in the working papers, has given them practical methodological help on "how to do" evangelism. On this we have been weak in the ecumenical movement, mostly not because of lack of confidence in the effectiveness of the Word of God, but rather because we were, and still are, struggling with the question of how the "instruments" of evangelism - the churches, congregations, individual Christians - could back up their message by their lives and deeds in a world full of injustice and oppression.

Lausanne - in spite of a certain surface optimism - has clearly come to face this question too:

"A church which preaches the Cross must itself be marked by the Cross!"

"The message of salvation implies also a message of judgement upon every form of alienation, oppression and discrimination, and we should not be afraid to denounce evil and injustice wherever they exist."

"Our Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism, and so is that kind of dialogue whose purpose is to listen sensitively in order to understand."

"A reduction of foreign missionaries and money in an evangelized country may sometimes be necessary to facilitate the national church's growth in self-reliance and to release resources for unevangelized areas."

These are all quotations from "The Lausanne Covenant", the solemn declaration which was issued by the Congress at the end. As this covenant will be spread widely anyway, we need not reprint it here.

Let me rather share with you a paper which was drafted by a group who tried to focus what "radical discipleship" means - it is called "A Response to Lausanne".

To sum up: I do not nourish a vague optimism for cheap reconciliation. Real reconciliation is always costly. But Bangkok and Lausanne have prepared the ground for serious searching and wrestling for the truth together. Some cold warriors will remain in their trenches. But in Lausanne the spirit of urgency was conjured. So we had better move soon and try to fulfil together the tasks which God lays before our feet today.

Gerhard Hoffmann

"A Response To Lausanne" - from Lausanne

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me
because he has anointed me -
to proclaim good news to the poor;
he has sent me to herald
liberation for captives and
recovery of sight for the blind,
to give freedom to those who are oppressed.

Luke 4:18

As the Father has sent me, so I am sending you.

John 20

God is making known the good news;
Shalom through Jesus, he is Lord of all.

Acts 10:36

God was well pleased through him to
reconcile the whole universe back to
himself, making shalom through the
blood of his Cross.

Colossians 1:20

A number of issues have thrust themselves upon us from papers delivered in this Congress and, from the subsequent wrestling with them under the authority of God's word, a number of us have felt the compulsion of his Spirit to share this response.

WE AFFIRM that ...

The EVANGEL is God's good news in Jesus Christ; it is good news of the reign he proclaimed and embodies; of God's mission of love to restore the world to wholeness through the Cross of Christ and him alone; of his victory over the demonic powers of destruction and death; of his Lordship over the entire universe; it is good news of a new creation, a new humanity, a new birth through him by his life-giving Spirit; of the gifts of the messianic reign contained in Jesus and mediated through him by his Spirit; of the charismatic community empowered to embody his reign of shalom here and now before the whole creation and make his good news seen and known. It is good news of liberation, of restoration, of wholeness, and of salvation that is personal, social, global and cosmic. Jesus is Lord! Alleluia! Let the earth hear his voice!

The COMMUNICATION OF THE EVANGEL in its fulness to every person worldwide is a mandate of the Lord Jesus to his community. There is no biblical dichotomy between the word spoken and the word made visible in the lives of God's people. Men will look as they listen and what they see must be at one with what they hear. The Christian community must chatter, discuss and proclaim the Gospel; it must express the Gospel in its life as the new society, in its sacrificial service of others as a genuine expression of God's love, in its prophetic exposing and opposing of all demonic forces that deny the Lordship of Christ and keep men less than fully human, in its pursuit of real justice for all men, in its responsible and caring trusteeship of God's creation and its resources.

There are times when our communication may be by attitude and action

only, and times when the spoken word will stand alone; but we must repudiate as demonic the attempt to drive a wedge between evangelism and social action.

THE RESPONSE DEMANDED BY THE EVANGEL is that men and women repent of their sin and every other lordship than that of Jesus Christ, and commit themselves to him to serve him in the world. Men are not already reconciled to God and simply awaiting the realization of it. Nor can biblical authority be found for the false hope of universalism; the reality of the eternal destruction of evil and all who cling to it must be solemnly affirmed, however humbly agnostic the Bible requires us to be about its nature.

Salvation is by God's grace on the sole ground of Christ's atoning death and resurrection and is received by obedient faith. Repentance is demanded; men must experience a change of understanding, attitude and orientation. But the new birth is not merely a subjective experience of forgiveness. It is a placement within the messianic community. God's new order which exists as a sign of God's reign to be consummated at the end of the age.

METHODS IN EVANGELIZATION must centre in Jesus Christ who took our humanity, our frailty, our death and gave himself in suffering servanthood for others. He sends his community into the world, as the Father sent him, to identify and agonize with men, to renounce status and demonic power, and to give itself in selfless service of others for God. Those who proclaim the Cross must be continually marked by the Cross. With unashamed commitment to Jesus Christ we must engage in the mutual listening of dialogue, the reward of which is understanding. We need to meet men on their own ground and be particularly attentive to the powerless. We must use the language, thought-forms and imagery appropriate to differing cultures. As Christians, we must live in such unity and love that men may believe. We must allow God to make visible in the new humanity the quality of life that reflects Christ and demonstrates his reign. We must respect cultural integrity while being free from all that denies or distorts the Lordship of Christ. God's Spirit overcomes all barriers of race, colour and culture.

STRATEGY FOR WORLD EVANGELIZATION in our generation is with God, from whom we eagerly anticipate the renewal of his community, equipping us with love and power so that the whole Christian community may make known the whole Gospel to the whole man throughout the whole world. We believe God to be calling us into greater unity and partnership throughout the earth to fulfil the commission of our Lord Jesus Christ.

WE CONFESS that ...

We have been failing in our obedience to the Lordship of Christ and have been refusing to submit to his word and be led by his Spirit.

We have failed to incarnate the Gospel and to come to men as servants for Christ's sake.

Our testimony has often been marred by triumphalism and arrogance, by lack of faith in God and by diminished love for his people.

We have often been in bondage to a particular culture and sought to

spread it in the name of Jesus.

We have not been aware of when we have debased and distorted the Gospel by acceptance of a contrary value system.

We have been partisan in our condemnation of totalitarianism and violence and have failed to condemn societal and institutionalized sin, especially that of racism.

We have sometimes so identified ourselves with particular political systems that the Gospel has been compromised and the prophetic voice muted.

We have frequently denied the rights and neglected the cries of the under-privileged and those struggling for freedom and justice.

We have often separated Jesus Christ the Saviour from Jesus Christ the Lord.

We have sometimes distorted the biblical understanding of man as a total being and have courted an unbiblical dualism.

We have insulated new Christians from life in the world and given simplistic responses to complex problems.

We have sometimes manipulated our message, used pressure techniques and been unduly preoccupied with statistics.

We have allowed eagerness for quantitative growth to render us silent about the whole counsel of God. We have been usurping God's Holy Spirit of love and power.

WE REJOICE ...

In our membership by his Spirit in the body of Christ and in the joy and love he has given us in each other.

In the openness and honesty with which we have met each other and have experienced mutual acceptance and forgiveness.

In the possibilities for men to read his word in their own languages through indigenous translations.

In the stimulation of mind and challenge to action that has come to us from his Word as we have placed the needs of our generation under its judgement and light.

In the prophetic voices of our brothers and sisters in this Congress, with whom we go forth in humility and hope.

In the certainty that the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our God and of his Christ. He shall reign for ever.
Alleluia!

WE RESOLVE ...

To submit ourselves afresh to the Word of God and to the leading of

his Spirit, to pray and work together for the renewal of his community as the expression of his reign, to participate in God's mission to his world in our generation, showing forth Jesus as Lord and Saviour, and calling on all men everywhere to repent, to submit to his Lordship, to know his salvation, to identify in him with the oppressed and work for the liberation of all men and women in his name.

LET THE EARTH HEAR HIS VOICE!

